

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

### Item 1

The Plan Change request is limited to removal of the eastern section of the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay from the North Halswell Outline Development Plan and Planning Map. Policy 8.2.2.12 and Matter of Discretion 8.8.15 will still apply to the area of the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay which is being retained.

The rules for subdivision in the Residential New Neighbourhood zone encourage engagement with the street through locating outdoor and indoor living spaces where they will achieve maximum solar gain. A diversity of typologies can be achieved through Rule 8.6.11 Table 8(A) which provides for various lot sizes. Typically, open space areas are only provided when specified in an ODP, where waterbodies are required to be enhanced and naturalised or where stormwater infrastructure is required (i.e. stormwater retention basins). The specific provisions in 8.8.15 for transport and infrastructure are not specific to the Meadowlands Exemplar and what is typically required for consideration as part of any subdivision development.

---

### Item 2

The District Plan rules that apply to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay are set out in Supplement 1 below. These rules are unique in that all development i.e. houses, are controlled through the Subdivision provisions. The subdivision provisions are long and complex. They also make reference to a number of other documents that are in place or to global-type consents for Neighbourhood Plans that are required as a prerequisite for individual houses. These provisions are complicated and were written, it would seem, on the assumption that housing would be established as part of group housing by a single organisation e.g. an organisation which has the specific purpose of creating “affordable” housing. This has made the approach of developing a subdivision and then marketing the sites to individual owners extremely challenging as all houses become Non-complying as they are not part of a “comprehensive” subdivision and land use consent. The list of “standards” in Rule 8.5.1.3 RD15 and Matter of Discretion 8.8.15 is extensive having approximately 115 listed matters (see below). Some of these standards in turn refer to matters to be addressed in other documents including the Statement of Commitment which is a 15 page document again listing higher level criteria and more detailed matters such as housing typologies and densities.

Added to all this complexity is the degree of discretion and interpretation about urban design matters which has resulted in drawn out processing times and unpredictability in how consents would be assessed.

A high level summary of the general consenting process that has occurred in the exemplar can be summarised as follows:

1. The first approach that informed the replacement District Plan hearings and resulted in the creation of the Meadowlands Exemplar zone was based on the following design rationales:

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

- Compact neighbourhoods and compact housing reducing the impact of the built environment on the natural environment
- Mitigation of cross-boundary effects through comprehensive design. For example, shading can be mitigated through the placement of building platforms which relate to those around it, privacy is mitigated through the placement of windows relative to the positioning of windows on other dwellings.
- Priority given to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and the reduction of the impact of the car in the environment
- Provide for mahinga kai; the ability to harvest food and plants

The approach above failed to achieve any traction due to the lack of any willing partners to undertake a design-build project of the scale required to achieve the outcomes underpinning the rationale behind the Exemplar.

Although inherent to the Exemplar zone and key to principles of reduced vehicle dominance and mahinga kai, design elements such as the edge lanes through the central reserve and community gardens and fruit trees forming part of the living streets that extended from the central reserve were not supported by Council at consent stage. Other design initiatives related to the reduction in permeable surfaces, pavement types, landscaping of the public realm and treatment of the central reserve space were also not supported by Council.

2. The second approach that was adopted to try and salvage the Exemplar development was for a subdivision and land use consent to be approved which included house plans for each lot created, consisting of a mixture of standalone, duplex and terrace developments. The applicant undertook to pre-design the dwelling units for each lot to achieve the original outcomes informing the Exemplar. The overwhelming majority of these designs were 2-storey.

This approach was unsuccessful largely due to the fact that purchasers sought the freedom and flexibility to design their own houses as opposed to buying a lot with pre-designed dwelling already allocated to it. The principle tenet being that those who were in the market to purchase bare land were motivated to design and build what they wanted, as opposed to being committed to a specific design. A further detraction to this approach was the dominance of two-storey designs. There was a strong market preference for single storey design.

To emphasise that this approach was unsuccessful, all 31 designs that formed part of the first stage of the development were altered by way of a variation pursuant to s127, some sites being subject to more than one variation. Obtaining variations for alternative designs proved extremely difficult due to the friction caused between what prospective purchasers wanted to design and the type of dwelling they wanted to live, verses what the Exemplar provisions encouraged.

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

3. The third attempt to achieve some traction within the Exemplar development revolved around the creation of development lots. Aligned with these development lots was an updated Neighbourhood Plan and a set of Architectural Design Principles and a Front Yard Landscape Guideline that were intended to inform the further development of the development lots. The requirement to development in accordance with the landscape and design principles was imposed on each development lot by consent notice.

Minimal development within the Exemplar was facilitated as a result of this approach. No development lots were sold to future builders. An internal re-development of one development block was undertaken to facilitate the sale of three sites. The overwhelming nature of feedback received from prospective purchasers of the development lots was that the design process was overly complicated and the consent process for dwelling design was very subjective, entirely related to the opinions of Council Officer's processing each consent.

For the purpose of clarification, the use of 'overcomplicated' as a descriptor relates to the fact that any future design of a dwelling needed to comply with a set of guidelines that sat outside the District Plan (i.e. Consent Notice) and included matters that weren't traditionally controlled by a District Plan (e.g. roof type), included matters that were directly the opposite of the controls in the District Plan (e.g. minimum and maximum setbacks that actually required building closer to the road as opposed to maintaining a setback from it) and prioritised compliance over typical design principles (e.g. window placements & south facing outdoor areas).

4. The final attempt to progress the Exemplar development resulted in a re-design of the previous development blocks, to create a new layout consisting of standalone lots. A subdivision consent was applied for along with a land use consent for each lot. The land use consent sought to impose design standards as conditions. A sample of 'conditions' is provided below:

3. Roofs shall:

- a. Have a minimum pitch of 28 degrees;
- b. For the highest ridge, be open-gable ended at both ends;
- c. Not be hip roofs where facing a [road](#) or [reserve boundary](#).

Except that:

- a. A maximum of 25% of the roof area (measured in plan view) may be flat (with a pitch of less than 5 degrees) if flat roofed elements are under 3.2m in [height](#);
- b. Garden sheds are excluded from this condition;
- c. Two story [buildings](#) may have hip roofs over two storey elements.

4. Front doors, porches and glazing:

- a. Where a site has a boundary along a road, any residential unit shall have an individual hinged front door facing at least one road boundary.
- b. Above the door required by Condition 4(a) shall be a covered porch area with dimensions of at least 1m wide by 1m deep.
- c. Any façade facing a road or reserve boundary shall have a minimum of 15% glazed frontage.
- d. Glazing facing a road boundary or reserve boundary at the ground level of the building shall be vertically orientated:

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

- i. With a height that is greater than its width;
- ii. May alternatively have a width up to twice the height, if the glazing is divided into 3 or more vertically oriented panels of the same width.

### Energy Efficiency

27. All residential units are to be designed with the following features:

- i. Dedicated mechanical extraction in kitchen & bathrooms in addition to Building Code requirements.
- ii. WELS 3 star shower.
- iii. WELS 4 star toilets / dual flush.
- iv. WELS 4 star taps.

28. In addition to the requirements set in Condition 27, all residential units will be designed with the features set out in either Column 1 or Column 2 of the table below:

Column 1	Column 2
Ceiling insulation R4.0	A heating load requirement equal to or less than 70 kwh/yr/m <sup>2</sup> per unit.
Wall insulation R2.2	
Windows with a R-value of 0.43 minimum (options include thermally broken double glazed aluminium windows, double glazed PVC, or double glazed timber framed windows).	

Note: The heating load requirement can be measured using the Annual Loss Factor tool run by BRANZ (<http://alf.branz.co.nz>) or Design Navigator (<https://www.designnavigator.solutions/>).

29. At the building consent application stage, a Licensed Building Practitioner or Homestar Assessor shall certify in writing that the requirements of Conditions 27 and 28 have been incorporated into the building design.

The difficulty created by these consent conditions has been the subjective way in which they have been assessed in Council and similar type comments received from Council as has occurred previously in relation to steadfast compliance being preferred over less than optimal design outcomes. This discord creates a lengthy and costly consent process all of which reflects poorly on the Exemplar. Some examples of this include:

- Kitchens that face a street being unable to have a horizontal window along benchtops – due to vertical windows being preferred
- South facing street elevations requiring 15% minimum glazing, whilst still trying to achieve a higher level of internal energy efficiency than building code
- No dispensation being given to corner sites – in respect of glazing, gable ends

Furthermore, we have encountered numerous situations where what has been perceived to be a compliant dwelling design, is issued with a s37 certificate during building consent processing due to a possible non-compliance with these conditions.

Upon following such matters up, interpretation differences as to the intent of conditions has arisen, erroneous assessments from Council have occurred and minor non-compliances with conditions have also been identified. On these occasions a variation to consent conditions has been required, a process which introduces subjective decision making, delays and cost to a project that had already proceeded to building consent stage.

Attached in Appendix 1 is one (RMA/2019/1069) of at least 22 resource consents applied for. The

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

Introduction to this decision gives some idea of the complexity with references to various consents granted over time which have needed to be varied for individual lots.

One of the methods adopted to create a more user friendly development was undertaken by applying for a subdivision consent which created the road network, central reserve and 54 residential lots (RMA/2018/2868). Following this a global land use consent (RMA/2019/1069) for the 54 residential lots consented under the subdivision consent mentioned previously. The land use consent imposed a suite of conditions that controls built form in a manner which is consistent with the outcomes sought for the Meadowlands Exemplar and underlying RNN zoning. These conditions were drafted in collaboration with Council officers following numerous discussions. The Planners report for this consent states “Included within the proposed conditions are those relating to the architectural character of the Meadowlands Exemplar specifically, more standard built form requirements (commensurate with the Residential New Neighbourhood zone)”.

### Supplement to Item 2

The District Plan controls specifically relating to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay are:

#### 14.12 Rules - Residential New Neighbourhood Zone

1. Advice note:
2. The rules relevant to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay in the Residential New Neighbourhood (North Halswell) Zone shown on Planning Map 45 are contained in Chapter 8, see Rules 8.5.1.3 RD15, 8.5.1.4 D5 and 8.5.1.5 NC8.

#### Subdivision rules

RD15	<p>Within the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay in the Residential New Neighbourhood (North Halswell) Zone as shown on <a href="#">Planning Map 45</a>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Comprehensive <a href="#">subdivision</a> and land use activities that implement the Meadowlands Exemplar approved by the <a href="#">Council</a> on 24 April 2014.</li> <li>4. Any application arising from this rule shall not require the written approval of other persons and shall not be publicly notified.</li> </ol>
------	--

#### Standards that apply to RD15

1. The [subdivision](#) and land use consent application shall be processed together.
2. [Buildings](#) shown in the comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application shall meet the following built form standards:
  1. Maximum [height](#) of any [building](#) : 11m.
  2. Maximum number of storeys in [buildings](#): 3.
  3. Minimum number of storeys for residential [buildings](#) facing the [Key Activity Centre](#): 2.
  4. Where the standards in i. - iii. inclusive above are not met, the activity status shall remain Restricted Discretionary with the [Council's](#) discretion restricted to the matters set out in Rule [8.8.15.13](#).
3. The comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application shall be accompanied by a [Neighbourhood Plan](#) which shall cover a minimum area of 8ha and address the matters set out at Rule [8.6.13](#).
4. The comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application shall be:
  1. for a developable area of at least 7000m<sup>2</sup> within the 8ha [Neighbourhood Plan](#) area; and
  2. in accordance with the [outline development plan](#) in [Appendix 8.10.4A](#), except that:
    1. Where open space is shown on an [outline development plan](#) and that land is not required by the Council as a recreation reserve or local purpose reserve then that land can be developed for residential purposes in accordance with the wider outline development plan intentions.
    3. Where the comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application is not in accordance with the outline development plan in [Appendix 8.10.4](#), the application status shall remain restricted discretionary, with the [Council's](#) discretion restricted to the Matters set out in Rule [8.8.15.7](#).
5. The comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application may include [future development allotments](#).
6. The comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application shall contain 3 or more of the following [building](#) typologies:
  1. [Standalone House](#);
  2. [Duplex](#);
  3. [Terrace](#);

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

4. [Apartment](#);  
with no single typology making up more than two thirds of the total number of [residential units](#).
7. The comprehensive [subdivision](#) and land use consent application shall only be in accordance with the Meadowlands Exemplar approved by the [Council](#) on 24 April 2014.
8. The activity standard specified in Rule [8.6.8\(e\)](#)

<b>D5</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Within the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay in the Residential New Neighbourhood (North Halswell) Zone as shown on <a href="#">Planning Map 45</a>, comprehensive <a href="#">subdivision</a> and land use activities under Rule <a href="#">8.5.1.3</a> RD15 for activities that do not comply with activity standard Rule <a href="#">8.5.1.3</a> RD15 (d)(i.)</li> <li>2. The consent application shall not require the written approval of other persons and shall not be publicly notified.</li> <li>3. In determining whether to grant or decline consent and impose conditions, the <a href="#">Council</a> will consider the matters in Rule <a href="#">8.8.15</a> and any other relevant matter.</li> </ol>
-----------	---

<b>NC8</b>	Within the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay in the Residential New Neighbourhood (North Halswell) Zone as shown on <a href="#">Planning Map 45</a> , comprehensive <a href="#">subdivision</a> and land use consent application for activities that are not otherwise listed as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities, or any subdivision or land use activities that are not part of a comprehensive subdivision and land use activity.
------------	---

### Matters of discretion

#### 8.8.15 Residential New Neighbourhood Zone Outline Development Plans - North Halswell (Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay) and East Papanui

##### 8.8.15.1 Place making, context, and heritage

1. Whether the subdivision, site and building design and allotment layout:
  1. addresses the existing context, including retention of natural and built features, adjacent patterns of development and potential visual and physical connections;
  2. creates a distinctive identity;
  3. distributes allotments for higher density building typologies to support community and retail facilities and public transport, and create a critical mass of activity and focus;
  4. locates larger allotments on corner sites to provide for larger scale multi residential unit building typologies that address adjacent streets and open spaces and assist neighbourhood legibility;
  5. provides public and private space, including communal space that is usable and accessible, incorporates large scale tree planting, and low impact design features;
  6. responds to, and complements the design and layout of adjacent blocks, streets and open spaces;
  7. has dimensions and an orientation which provide for efficient vehicle access and parking, including garage spaces, that is safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and does not compromise the quality of current or future public or private space;
  8. promotes building typologies that protect the privacy and outlook of adjacent sites;
  9. promotes building typologies that retain the central area of the block for open space or shared vehicle access; and
  10. minimises the use of rear allotments and long cul-de-sacs.
11. Whether in relation to Spreydon Lodge the:
  1. use of the lodge and its curtilage is compatible with its heritage values, including historic heritage trees, whilst enabling its viable economic use, as informed by advice from:
    12. a historian or architectural historian as part of the comprehensive subdivision and land use consent application;
    13. a qualified arborist to determine the age, health, species, historical and scientific significance of the trees.

##### 8.8.15.2 Building typology, mix and location

1. Whether there is a sufficient mix of the following residential unit types:
  1. standalone house; and
  2. duplex; and
  3. terrace; and
  4. apartment;
1. Whether residential unit typologies are integrated with other typologies across the block to provide a cohesive street scene and neighbourhood, and good levels of privacy and daylight.
2. Whether the distribution of residential unit typologies across the development complements and supports the location of community facilities provided as part of the comprehensive subdivision and land use consent application.
3. Whether the location of residential units (including location of residential units) to the edge of the block, and/or the location of terrace dwellings parallel to the street:
  1. address and provide surveillance to the street;
  2. protect privacy of adjacent neighbours;
  3. protect and enhance private back yards and planting opportunities at scale; and
  4. allow for the comprehensive management of vehicle access and car parking.

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

4. Whether multiunit, multi-storey building typologies are located at corner sites in order to:
  1. improve way finding and distinction of streets;
  2. enable orientation of the building toward both adjacent streets in a manner which emphasises these corners;
  3. utilise the increased access to light and outlook provided by the street edges; and
  4. provide efficient site access for vehicles and pedestrians.
5. Whether an appropriate building typology is located on an appropriate site to achieve a balance of open space to buildings across the block and on the site and which provides for:
  1. tree and garden planting;
  2. pedestrian and vehicle access;
  3. a high level of visual interaction between the building and street or other public space;
  4. single level typologies on larger sites and smaller houses on smaller sites; and
  5. minimisation of building footprint and hard surfaces.
6. Whether garages and parking are secondary to habitable spaces, both with respect to size and expression of form, and are incorporated into the overall site and building design especially when accessed off streets.

### 8.8.15.3 Relationship to street and public open spaces

1. Whether the subdivision design:
  2. provides allotments, which enable the construction of buildings, that provide habitable rooms and front entrances which address the street, open space or reserves that are adjacent to or opposite the allotment;
  3. minimises the visual dominance, of access on the streetscape or adjacent open space;
  4. avoids allotments which necessitate the erection of bunds or large visually impermeable fencing adjacent to the street, lane or other publically accessible open space to create privacy;
  5. ensures there is sufficient tree and garden planting particularly in regard to road frontage, building entrances, boundaries, accesses car parking and stormwater management areas to visually soften the built form and associated areas of paving; and
  6. ensures that building setbacks provide for variety and amenity in the streetscape, recognising the orientation of the street, while reducing building dominance.

### 8.8.15.4 Fences between residential units and the road boundary

14. Whether any fences constructed in the space between the road boundary and the residential unit will adversely affect surveillance of the street from the ground floor glazing in the residential unit.

### 8.8.15.5 Road network access and parking

15. Whether:
  16. direct access on to State Highways, other than access in accordance with the Outline Development Plan in Appendix 8.10.4, would result in adverse effects on the safety or efficiency of the State Highway;
  17. the road, cycle and pedestrian features integrate in a practical and functional manner with the adjoining existing road network, cycle, and pedestrian routes and allows for future connections to the wider neighbourhood;
  18. the road layout and width within the comprehensive development area achieves a safe, well connected, multi modal, and highly permeable movement network and supports a functional hierarchy of streets with appropriate public transport facilities;
  19. any reduction in legal road width or road reserve is balanced with private and/or public space amenity, including large scale tree planting;
  20. the design defines the identity, entry point, and function of lanes through:
    21. shared vehicle and pedestrian access with no defined footpath;
    22. variation in lane clearway through design by tightening, extending and terminating views within a lane;
    23. a consistent character; and
    24. the use of landscape treatment including changes in paving material and tree and garden planting; and
    25. on site parking, access and driveways are safe and efficient for residents and visitors.

### 8.8.15.6 Infrastructure

26. Whether appropriate provision is made for the ongoing maintenance of any open space areas not vested in the Council and the appropriateness of any mechanism proposed to ensure that open space areas not vested in the Council are available for public access.
27. Whether the requirements set out by network utility operators in relevant guidelines are met so as to ensure:
28. network infrastructure can be operated safely and efficiently;
29. access is available for maintenance;
30. buildings are not erected within the minimum safe distances specified in Table 3 of New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice 34:2001; and
31. the planting of trees is not inconsistent with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.
32. Whether the proposed subdivision provides a quality and appropriate interface with existing or proposed non-road infrastructure, including network infrastructure, and avoids reverse sensitivity in relation to that infrastructure.
33. Whether a reticulated sewer can be installed to the development allotments without the need for more than one waste water pumping station within the development area.
34. Whether the provisions of the Council's Infrastructure Design Standard and / or Construction Specification Standard are met.

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

35. Whether stormwater management features such as soil absorption, sedimentation and detention basins, rain gardens, swales, trapped sumps, first flush basins, wetlands or wet ponds contribute to an integrated naturalised surface water network, including the road stormwater treatment design.
36. Whether the proposed surface water management systems are consistent with or otherwise achieve the outcomes anticipated by the relevant Council Stormwater Management Plans and / or Integrated Catchment Management Plans and / or any planned surface water works for the South West of Christchurch.
37. Whether the proposals for the enhancement of aesthetic and environmental values of artificial drains adequately provides for the establishment of a more natural channel form, and indigenous re-vegetation.
38. Whether there is sufficient capacity available in the Council's surface water network to cater for discharges from the development.
39. Whether adverse effects of the proposal on groundwater, surface water, mahinga kai, or drainage to, or from, adjoining land can be avoided or mitigated.
40. Whether adverse effects on the functioning or values of the existing network of drains, springs, waterways and ponding areas can be avoided or mitigated.
41. Whether the provision for, and protection of, the flood storage and conveyance capacity of waterways is adequate.
42. Whether the proposal appropriately utilises the existing or proposed topography, including open waterway systems, and proposed networks to convey surface water by way of gravity systems.
43. Whether appropriate and safe access for maintenance of surface water infrastructure is provided.
44. Whether the proposals to control erosion and sediment during the construction phase of works is adequate, and the extent to which these proposals comply with local and regional guidelines.
45. Whether it is necessary or appropriate to require any easements, consent notices, or local purpose reserves.
46. Whether there are adverse effects on public health and how these can be avoided and mitigated.
47. Whether the works appropriately incorporate indigenous vegetation which reflects Ngai Tahu's history and identity associated with the land, taking into account the ability of particular species to manage stormwater.
48. Whether a management plan has been developed that demonstrates there will be ongoing operation and maintenance of the stormwater.
49. Whether all allotments have an approved connection to reticulated sewer, stormwater, and water networks and the capacity to connect to electrical and telecommunication networks.

### 8.8.15.7 Compliance with the Outline Development Plan

50. Whether the departure from the layout in the outline development plan is appropriate taking into account:
  51. the overall vision and intent as expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan; and
  52. any actual or potential impact on the delivery of integrated infrastructure including road, water, wastewater, stormwater and open space across the whole outline development plan area.

### 8.8.15.8 Water supply for fire-fighting

53. Whether sufficient firefighting water supply is provided so as to ensure the health and safety of the community, including neighbouring properties, is provided.

### 8.8.15.9 Outdoor Living space

54. Whether the level, location or configuration of outdoor living space will provide for the needs of occupants, taking into account:
  55. In relation to the amount of outdoor living space:
    56. provision of publicly available space on, or in close proximity to, the site to meet the needs of occupants now and in the future;
    57. the size of the residential unit serviced by the space and the demands of the likely number of occupants now and in the future; and
    58. compensation by alternative space within buildings with access to ample sunlight and fresh air.
  59. In relation to the location and configuration of outdoor living space:
    60. allocation between private and communal outdoor living spaces within the site to meet the current and future needs of occupants of the site;
    61. easy accessibility of outdoor living space to all occupants of the site;
    62. design of communal space to clearly signal that it is for communal use and meets the needs of occupants and provides a high level of residential amenity;
    63. the adverse effects of any additional loss of mature on-site vegetation and/or spaciousness of the area.

### 8.8.15.10 Service, storage, and waste management spaces

64. Whether, there is sufficient useful and functional service, waste management, and storage space, taking into account:
  65. the adequacy of the amount of space to store rubbish and recycling, whether communal, outdoor or indoor;
  66. the adequacy of the volume of space provided for personal storage;
  67. the convenience of the location of rubbish and recycling space for residents;
  68. how the lack of screening of any outdoor service space will adversely affect the visual amenity within the site and of any adjoining site, activity, or the street scene;
  69. the size and flexibility of the residential unit layout to provide other indoor storage options where an indoor storage space is not provided for each unit; and
  70. the adequacy, accessibility and convenience of alternative storage areas provided on the site where indoor storage space is not provided for each residential unit.



## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

### 8.8.15.11 Minimum unit size

71. Whether the unit size is appropriate taking into account:
72. the floorspace available and the internal layout and their ability to support the amenity of current and future occupants;
73. other on-site factors that would compensate for a reduction in unit sizes e.g. communal facilities;
74. scale of adverse effects associated with a minor reduction in size in the context of the overall residential complex on the site; and
75. any social housing requirements.

### 8.8.15.12 Consistency with the statement of commitment to exemplar housing

76. Whether the comprehensive subdivision and land use consent is consistent with the "Meadowlands An Exemplar Housing Development Statement of Commitment" as approved by the Council on 24 April 2014.

### 8.8.15.13 Height, minimum and maximum storeys

77. Whether the increased height intrusion would result in buildings that:
  78. remain compatible with the scale of other buildings anticipated in the area; or
  79. do not compromise the amenity of adjacent properties; taking into account:
  80. The visual dominance of proposed buildings on the outlook from adjacent sites, roads and public open space in the surrounding area, which is out of character with the local environment;
  81. Overshadowing of adjoining sites internal and external living spaces;
  82. Any potential loss of sunlight admission to internal living spaces in winter with regard to energy utilisation;
  83. Any loss of privacy through being over-looked from neighbouring buildings;
  84. Whether development on the adjoining site, such as large building setbacks, location of outdoor living spaces, or separation by land used for vehicle access, reduces the need for protection of adjoining site from overshadowing;
  85. The ability to mitigate any adverse effects of height breaches through increased separation distances between the building and adjoining site, the provision of screening or any other methods; and
  86. Whether any additional stories within the 11m height limit would create unduly confined spaces with limited usability.
  87. Whether there is an inappropriate step change in heights between the Key Activity Centre and the exemplar area.
- 

### Item 3

If the Exemplar zone is to be uplifted, the underlying zone is RNN. This zone has a density requirement of 15hh/ha. Given the extent of land required for stormwater, it is assumed any future development of this area will achieve the 15hh/ha density requirement. Please note this request is for a plan change. There is no underlying subdivision consent that forms part of this request.

---

### Item 4

This table lists the resource consents which have been obtained by the applicant for the Meadowlands Exemplar. We wish to note that this list only demonstrates the resource consents which have been obtained where the applicant has engaged Davie Lovell Smith. There may be other resource consents which have been applied for by other consultants or building companies.

Consent Number	Reason	Date Consent was granted
RMA/2016/2585 (Subdivision) & RMA/2016/2586 (Landuse)	Combined subdivision and land use application for medium density residential development (18 residential units/lots)	15-08-2015
RMA/2015/2816 (Former reference RMA92031180)	Comprehensive landuse and subdivision application for 13 units including earthworks	12-01-2016
RMA/2015/472 (Former reference	Earthworks	14-03-2016

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

RMA92028681)		
RMA/2016/1488	Relocate, adapt and reuse Spreydon Lodge as a café/restaurant with associated car parking, access and landscaping.	30-08-2016
RMA/2016/2904 (Subdivision) & RMA/2016/2908 (Landuse)	Combined subdivision and land use application for medium density residential development (ten residential lots and five development lots)	19-10-2016
RMA/2016/2778	2 Lot subdivision, road construction and associated earthworks	17-11-2016
RMA/2016/3525	Relocate, adapt and reuse Spreydon Lodge as a development management, sales and display office with associated car parking, access and landscaping	31-01-2017
RMA/2016/2904A & RMA/2017/475	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2904 & RMA/2016/2908	29-05-2017
RMA/2017/442	Change conditions of RMA/2015/2816	2-06-2017
RMA/2017/417	Three Lot Fee Simple Subdivision	9-06-2017
RMA/2016/2904/B	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2904	25-08-2017
RMA/2017/2815	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2586	07-12-2017
RMA/2015/2816/B	Change conditions of RMA/2015/2816	21-08-2018
RMA/2015/2816/D	Change conditions of RMA/2015/2816	20-12-2018
RMA/2018/2542	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2586	12-12-2018
RMA/2018/2929	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2908	15-02-2019
RMA/2019/130	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2586	5-04-2019
RMA/2019/1069	Land use consent for development on 54 residential lots	12-08-2019
RMA/2018/2868/B	Change conditions of RMA/2018/2868	7-11-2019
RMA/2019/1996	Change conditions of RMA/2018/2868	18-11-2019
RMA/2019/2381	8 lot subdivision for residential development	21-11-2019
RMA/2019/779	Two duplex residential units (for a total of four units)	25-11-2019
RMA/2019/1993	Change conditions of RMA/2018/2868	11-12-2019
RMA/2018/2868/C	Change conditions of RMA/2018/2868	12-08-2020
RMA/2020/902	10 lot subdivision for residential development	30-09-2020
RMA/2020/2022	Change conditions of RMA/2016/2586	15-10-2020
RMA/2020/2262	Four lot subdivision for residential development	30-10-2020
RMA/2020/2264	Two lot subdivision for residential development	30-10-2020
RMA/2020/2266	Two lot subdivision for residential development	30-10-2020
RMA/2021/211	Duplex comprising two Residential Units	2-03-2021
RMA/2021/210	Duplex comprising two Residential Units	3-03-2021

The costs associated with obtaining these consents have not been tallied in detail but the applicant has advised that these are considerable, possibly in the order of \$180,000.

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

### Item 5

In usual circumstances, subdivisions are created with varying lot sizes to enable a variety of houses to be built on each of the lots created. Building companies and lot owners can then rely on the built form standards for the zone and design and build their houses accordingly without the need for land use consents. The complexity created by the Exemplar Overlay is that there are no built form standards in the District Plan to guide building companies and lot owners. In addition, the Exemplar requires specific building typologies in specific locations. Prior to obtaining the global consents mentioned above, purchasers would need to buy a 'block' and develop a certain number of houses with a variety of housing typologies. This is a very uncommon approach for building companies in New Zealand.

With regard to timeframes a typical due diligence exercise is 15 days, whereas with the Exemplar due diligence this has on average taken 40 days with an extended settlement date and in many cases the contracts have not been confirmed i.e. 15-20 have fallen through.

---

### Item 6

Reference to the Statement of Commitment is made in the Matters of Discretions 8.8.15.12 which applies to Subdivision Rule RD15. It is noted that as there is no other standard specifying densities for the Overlay area that Council processing staff have used the densities referred to the Statement of Commitment as a baseline for their assessments.

---

### Item 7

The reference in section 2.4 is incorrect as the requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan is contained in the standards applying to Comprehensive Subdivision and Land use consents provided for in Subdivision Rule RD15. Please refer to the response in Item 2 regarding the list of provisions.

---

### Item 8

The policy difference is the concept of fully integrated development where house type and design is coordinated and consented through approval of neighbourhood plans and associated subdivision.

---

### Items 9 -12

A map is unnecessary to understand the detail referred to in paragraph 3.1.5 as it merely describes what is shown on the North Halswell ODP.

The reference to the eastern area being developed with a similar look to the western section of the Exemplar Overlay area is based primarily on the logical extension of the roading pattern and adherence to the ODP.

To date the developer has used a suite of development controls to maintain a high level of design and finishing within the Exemplar and RNN development. It is the intention of the developer to continue with this practise. Given this is a plan change request and includes no subdivision

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

component, the RNN regulatory framework (including the ODP) is relied upon in the first instance to achieve design and amenity outcomes consistent with what is contemplated within the District Plan.

It should be added that the applicant is loath to volunteer details and initiatives that relate to the subdivision of land within the ODP in response to the RFI given that previous reliance on structural aspects of the ODP has been misguided. Landscaping, reserve size and extent, Quarrymans Trail and road alignments have been significantly changed by Council's hand since the ODP became operative.

---

### Item 13

The development that will occur in the eastern section of the Overlay under the Residential New Neighbourhood provisions will be similar or potentially greater in yield than has occurred under the regime used for the western section. This is based on the RNN minimum density requirement of 15hh/ha, the general minimum lot size being 300m<sup>2</sup>. That being the case it is considered that the proposal will give effect to:

- NPS-UD Objective 3 as more people will be enabled to live in an area of high demand
  - NPS-UD Policy 1 as people will be able to choose their homes and thereby create variety, different section sizes are provided for in the RNN provisions, and the area is one of the last available which is relatively close to the City Centre and places of employment and community facilities.
  - NPS-UD Policy 3 is about Councils altering their district plans to provide for more intensive development especially in relation to building height. This proposal does not change the current zonings and it is noted that the Overlay provision do not provide for greater height of buildings.
  - NPS-UD Policy 6 covers a very wide range of matters that need to be considered when making planning decisions. This proposal is simply bringing a small area into an existing zoning regime and so it is not considered that it will create any inconsistency with this policy.
- 

### Item 14

The RPS objective and policies referred to generally seek more intensive residential development and a greater range of housing types. It is possible that there may be less intensive development in the eastern area due to market demand however there is now a recognised change occurring where people are seeking alternatives to detached housing. It is therefore expected that there will be a variety of house types developed in the new area encouraged by the existing development. The RNN provisions provide for this to occur.

---

### Item 15

The applicants wish to carry on good urban design approaches in the development of the eastern section of the overlay area as it was their vision for this area that resulted in the creation of the Exemplar. However they do not consider that it is necessary or even desirable to have such a complex planning regime applying to subdivision and land use and so are not proposing any controls additional to those applying in the Residential New Neighbourhood zone.

---

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

### Items 16 – 17

Firstly we note that section 32(1) (c) specifically states that an evaluation report required under the Act must:

*contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.*

The assessment in the Plan Change Evaluation concludes that the impact of the removal of the Exemplar provisions on the character and amenity of the surrounding area will be limited and not adverse. The only obvious change is that potential purchasers of lots will have greater autonomy to design houses in line with their personal circumstances and preferences and will not have to go through a complicated consent process. This will not result in large scale or significant effects. At most there will be slightly reduced diversity of housing types. On this basis it is considered that detailed assessment of the proposal against a wide range of high level objectives and policies referred to in the items 16-17 is not required.

The objective or purpose of the requested plan change is simply to overcome the complexity associated with provisions associated with the comprehensive design-build approach. This is to be achieved by removing the application of the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay. The consequential subdivision and development of this eastern section will be similar but simpler under the RNN provisions which involve comprehensive assessment at the time of subdivision consent. This assessment involves consideration of all the additional matters listed in 8.8.9 of the Subdivision Chapter. The matters are extensive and include a specific set of consideration relation provision for a range of housing types. It is expected however that the applicant will take then initiative on this aspect and identify sites for specific housing typologies based on their extensive knowledge of the changing housing market. So a similar end result will be achieved but in a simpler and more cost effective manner.

---

### Item 18

The applicant has looked at options and no others were found to address the issue at hand in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Again it is noted that higher level assessment of this proposal is not required to the extent requested due to the proposals having limited or no effects on the environment.

---

### Item 19

In addition to the costs borne by the applicant we understand that processing the various consent types, many of which involve reference to earlier consents, has been costly for the Council with not all costs being able to be passed on. We suggest information on this may be obtained from Paul Lowe and Nathan Harris, CCC.

---

### Item 20

It is considered that the plan change request and this response to the request for information addresses all relevant matters listed in section 74 and 75(3) and (4) of the RMA.

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

### Item 21

The reference in 8.2.3 of the plan change request to Section 32(3) (a) was incorrect. The reference should have been to Section 32(1) (a).

---

### Item 22

The applicant has looked at options of how a simpler consent process could occur. Discussions were held with Council staff but no realistic alternatives were forthcoming. Given the complexity of the provisions it was concluded that the simplest option was to adopt the provisions that apply to the RNN developments as these have proven to be effective in achieving forms of development that the Council, the applicant and the public find satisfactory.

---

### Item 23

See comment above. The conclusion re costs was based on there being no easy solution and therefore there being a real likelihood that the process of developing another approach would be long and in the end possibly achieve little. This in fact is what has happened in consulting with the Council on this issue.

---

### Item 24

While there will always be issues with consistent administration of district plans over time due to various matters including staff changes, Option 2 involves a now well used set of provisions. The creation of many developments under RNN has also provided feedback for the Council and developers as to the effectiveness these provisions in achieving good outcomes. In contrast, due to the complexity of the Exemplar provisions, only a limited number of staff have ever been familiar with the provisions, and even then administration of the consents has not always been consistent.

---

### Item 25

The combination of 8.3.2, 8.4 and 8.5 effectively summarises the conclusions of the comparative costs and benefits.

---

### Items 26 and 27

No consultation has been undertaken with neighbours or Manawhenua as it is considered that there will be no negative impacts resulting from partial removal of the overlay.

---

### Item 28

The Flood Management Area and Liquefaction Management Area cover large areas of Christchurch that are being developed for residential use without creating an impediment. The implications of these natural hazard areas is the same regardless of whether the Exemplar Overlay is in place or not.

## Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan

---

### Item 29

The Council holds this information having processed the consents and presumably viewed the resulting developments.

---

### Item 30 – 32

All the information requested under these items is directly available to Council as it is in the District Plan. If more detail is required on design outcomes it is suggested that staff who have processed consent under both regimes are consulted.

---

### Item 33

It is not possible at this stage to know exactly what impact the change will have with regard to the range of building types as the removal of the Exemplar Overlay will give the applicant and intending purchasers more freedom in the design of their houses. However the applicant intends to make provision for a variety of typologies through future subdivision designs as they have observed a trend towards alternative housing types in recent times. In addition they wish to promote and retain an approach in keeping with the vision for the area. It is anticipated however that the variety will not be as great as is envisaged in the Exemplar Statement of Commitment and related documents.

---

### Item 34

There is no impediment to achieving a density of 15hh/ha under RNN.

---

### Item 35

It is not understood what is being requested.

---

### Item 36

The change is to the form of consenting for development in the area. It is anticipated that there will be no noticeable difference in terms of landscape and visual effects as the applicants wish the “look” to be retained throughout the development, especially in relation to landscaping.

---

### Items 37 and 38

The boundary did not intentionally cover half the neighbourhood park. The applicant is willing to consider minor realignment of this boundary to avoid any future administrative issues.

We note the Reserve shown on the OPD exists whether or not the Exemplar Overlay areas applies.

---

**Response to Request for Information - Plan Change 10, Christchurch District Plan**

---

**Item 39**

The applicant does not have any comment to make on the width of this reserve at this stage.

---

**Item 40**

We found the requirements provided difficult to apply and will need to work with Council staff to achieve this. However the plan provided is readily usable for notification of the Plan Change.

---

27 May 2010