

From: Stevenson, Mark
Sent: Monday, 23 August 2021 7:43 PM
To: Dixon, Glenda
Subject: Fwd: Meadowlands Private Plan Change 10
Attachments: 2nd Response to RFI PC10.docx; Comparison of standards.docx

For you to consider

Mark

From: Mark Brown <Mark.Brown@dls.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2021 5:40:30 PM
To: Stevenson, Mark <Mark.Stevenson@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc: Emily.Allan@ccc.govt.nz <Emily.Allan@ccc.govt.nz>; Patricia Harte <Patricia.Harte@dls.co.nz>
Subject: RE: Meadowlands Private Plan Change 10

Hi All
Please find the applicant's RFI response in respect of Private Plan Change 10 attached.
regards

Mark Brown
Director

 Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd
Planning Surveying Engineering
PO Box 679 | Christchurch | DDI: (03) 963 0710 | Mobile: 0275 489 560 | www.dls.co.nz

Confidentiality: The information contained in this email message may be legally privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately and destroy the original.

From: Stevenson, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Stevenson@ccc.govt.nz>]
Sent: 19 August 2021 20:33
To: Mark Brown
Subject: Meadowlands Private Plan Change 10

Hi Mark

I hope all is going well for you at level 4.

Thanks for the meeting we had with you and Ian last month. Can you please advise on progress and when you anticipate sending any additional response.
As discussed at the meeting, we are happy to discuss any matter where clarification is required or you don't think additional information is necessary,

Thanks

Mark

Mark Stevenson
Team Leader City Planning (W)
City Planning (W)

 [03 941 5583](tel:039415583)
 Mark.Stevenson@ccc.govt.nz
 Te Hononga Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
 PO Box 73012, Christchurch 8154
 ccc.govt.nz

Christchurch
City Council 

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete.

Christchurch City Council
<http://www.ccc.govt.nz>

MEMORANDUM

Attention: Mark Stevenson, Emily Allen

Company: Christchurch City Council

Date: 10 August 2021

From: Spreydon Lodge

Subject: Proposed Plan Change to the Christchurch District Plan

Job Ref: P20202

Response No.2 to Information Request

The following information and assessment is provided in response to matters raised in a meeting and a further email from Emily Allen to Patricia Harte dated 18 June 2021 following receipt of a written response to the Council RFI dated 8 April 2021.

The items below in many cases do not refer to the numbered items in the original RFI as the applicant is not clear which items the further requests relate to, if any.

1. Confirmation that RNN provisions apply to the Meadowlands Exemplar

The North Halswell Outline Development Plan clearly states that the Meadowlands Exemplar is an overlay. Residential New Neighbourhood remains the underlying zone. As a result of the plan change request the applicant is seeking the removal of the Exemplar overlay, with the expectation that the underlying RNN zone will apply to the residual land

2. Purpose of the proposed Plan Change 10 – Relates to Item 16 - S32(1)(b)

The purpose of the proposed Plan Change is to move to a more efficient and effective planning regime for development of the remainder of the Meadowlands Exemplar area within the North Halswell ODP. To date, as detailed in the Plan Change Request documentation, the processes that have been applied and modified over time have proven to be extremely inefficient and very costly. This has resulted in extensive delays and lack of interest by potential purchasers of dwellings within the Exemplar area.

The method chosen to achieve the purpose, after consideration of a number of options, is to simply remove the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay from the eastern section. This results in the underlying zoning of Residential New Neighbourhood zoning (RNN) and the associated subdivision provisions being the provisions that apply to the subdivision and use of this eastern area. Based on extensive experience with the RNN provisions the applicants are confident that the development path will be efficient and that there will be a high quality outcome. It is noted that the North Halswell Outline Development Plan applies whether or not the overlay is in place.

3. Further explanation of differences in outcomes sought by objectives and policies - Refer Item 8

Although the heading of Subdivision, Development and Earthworks **Objective 8.2.2** is *Design and amenity and the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay* these matters are addressed separately. Objective 8.2.2.a addresses design and amenity and is applicable to all subdivisions including the Meadowlands exemplar area. There is therefore the same outcomes sought for the land zoned RNN and land zoned RNN with the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay i.e. both have the objectives listed in 8.2.2.a. Regarding Objective 8.2.2.b this is limited to the exemplar and refers to “comprehensive planning that is environmentally and socially sustainable”. These

objectives are to be achieved through a set of policies 8.2.2.1 through to 8.2.2.11. These policies include many of the same matters that are referred to in the objectives and include the following aims for **subdivision**

- 8.2.2.1 - processes the enable recovery including subdivision of greenfield areas
- 8.2.2.2 –design and amenity incorporating character elects and promoting health and safety
- 8.2.2.3 - Allotments fit for purpose
- 8.2.2.4 – Elements to create or extend neighbourhood identity
- 8.2.2.5 – Sustainable design
- 8.2.2.6 – integration and connectivity within and between developments
- 8.2.2.7 - Provision of accessible open space
- 8.2.2.9 – Integrated development thorough outline development plans
- 8.2.2.10 - Comprehensive residential development in the Residential New Neighbourhood zone

In addition to these policies there is the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay comprehensive development policy 8.2.2.12 which lists matters that are to be attained to give effect to the overall vision for the exemplar. The matters listed i to xii are the same or very similar to those listed in the policies listed above

On this basis it is clear that the **outcomes** for the Underlying Residential new Neighbourhood zone and land within Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay are either the same or very similar.

The difference between the two regimes is therefore not at objective and policy level, it is at the rule requirement level, in particular the additional **requirement** for consent of Neighbourhood Plans and for these to include both the proposed subdivision and housing details. As explained in considerable detail in initial response to Item 2 of the RFI this requirement (large scale comprehensive development) has proven to be problematic in many ways such that outcomes within the Exemplar area have been achieved via the non-complying consenting pathway.

5. **RPS Policy 6.3.2 Urban Design Evaluation**

There is no reason to carry out an assessment of the Plan Change Request under RPS Policy 6.3.2 as it contains principles of urban design which are to be applied to a development seeking consent whereas the requested proposal is a plan change. The principles in this RPS Policy can and are able to be applied to any subdivision and development that requires consent regardless of whether they are zoned RNN or fall within the Exemplar Overlay. There should also be comfort from Council's perspective in this regard given that the policy framework within the District Plan that will inform any future consent application should not be inconsistent with the RPS given its higher order status.

6. **Iwi Management Plan**

An assessment under the Iwi Management Plan is considered to be unnecessary at this stage given the area is zoned for residential purposes and that is not proposed to change.

7. **Assessment against Objectives in addition to Strategic Directions Objectives 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 – Item 17**

As already stated in the Response to the RFI, the proposal is driven by the need to reduce the complexity of developing within the Exemplar framework. The Exemplar will remain over half of current overlay area, with the area subject to the plan change request proposed to be subject to the underlying RNN zone. Given that the proposal is relying on an existing underlying zone, there is no reason to construe this zone is inappropriate and therefore not consistent with the relevant objectives for RNN. These comments also apply to any assessment of the proposal in relation to section 5(2) a and c of the RMA.

In respect of the Strategic Directions, the proposal will not frustrate the intent of Objective 3.3.1 given that it is seeking to rely on an existing underlying zone that applies to the balance of the North Halswell ODP. With

regards to Objective 3.2.2 the proposal is entirely consistent with the outcomes intended in terms of transaction costs and reliance on consent processes and is easy to understand and use.

8. **Costs of applicants – Item 19**

The costs that are currently being borne by the applicant in working with the exemplar regime and details of consenting costs have already been provided. There are also costs such as the holding costs associated with developing land and having to construct small parcels of land which prevent economies of scale from being achieved. Such costs are commercially sensitive and cannot be divulged, however the notion and concept of cost effect and efficient development practice should not need to be expanded upon any further.

There are also additional (intangible) costs associated with having to manage the process of taking prospective purchasers through the complex process of choosing house designs and getting consents for any minor variations, including the removal of justifiable or unjustifiable s37 certificates issued via the building consent process. It is not possible to readily calculate these costs which are considerable.

9. **32 Assessment Options – Items 16-25**

More “information” has been requested on the options assessed in the section 32 analysis. In addition a fourth option of including “Meadowlands specific policies” is suggested.

Option 1 is to retain the Status Quo, namely to retain the full extent of the Meadowlands Exemplar area. The detail of the current Plan’s requirements and the alternative processes that have been tried/developed over time have been extensively described in the response to Item 2 of the RFI so no further explanation is required.

Option 2 is to remove the overlay from the south-eastern section of the Meadowland Exemplar Overlay. With regard to the form of development this south-eastern area would then be developed under RNN provisions which provides for a variety of housing typologies in response to demand. As the RNN provisions are applied/used on a daily basis by developers, designers, builders and Council officers, it is considered unnecessary to provide detailed information on this matter. Fundamentally it involves the usual subdivision processes guided by the objectives and policies referred to above (which also apply if the area remained subject to the exemplar overlay). This is the regime that the remainder of the Meadowlands block is being developed under as well as the balance of the North Halswell ODP.

The main advantages of this approach are two-fold. Firstly and importantly there is a simpler consent process involving initial consenting of the subdivision and layout along with its associated service provision, earthworks etc. If comprehensive or higher density development is sought that can be applied for at the same time or at a later stage. The second advantage is that it provides people with a flexibility of choice of housing typology and design, rather than having to accept some predetermined typology and/or having to obtain resource consent for design deviations from land use consent issued for each lot.

The importance of both rationales cannot be underestimated. Simple processes and familiarity allow for efficiencies in delivery, and coupled with flexibility and choice create an appealing package for those contemplating building (or buying) a new dwelling. The decision to build a new house is significant, the process can be intimidating and the cost is considerable. The removal of the Exemplar overlay and reliance on the underlying RNN zones enables the applicant to provide the necessary efficiencies, flexibility and choice that home builders and buyers are seeking.

Option 3 involves persuading the Council to adopt a simpler consent process for development within the Overlay area. Due to there being no framework for a change in processing to be “cemented” in place this option inherently does not provide a level of certainty necessary for the landowner in designing, consenting

and constructing a residential development or for the Council in consenting development. Removal of the overlay and full reliance on the RNN provisions and processes in comparison provides a level of certainty which is known to achieve efficient residential development and an efficient housing market.

An additional option has been suggested by the Council planner which we understand is to add a new exemplar policy relating to the southeast section and presumably remove the overlay and the associated rules package in the Subdivision Chapter from the southeast section. It is hard to see what this policy could achieve as subdivisions essentially are consented on the basis of meeting required standards and addressing all the matters referred to in subdivision policies 8.2.2 1 to 8.2.2.10. As referred to above these matters are the same policy matters that apply to the current exemplar overlay.

With regard to weighing up the costs and benefits of the options this has been done in a manner which is common, namely a brief description of these. It is not possible to provide a direct comparison between the Benefits/advantage and Costs/disadvantages because there is no common denominator. This occurs in the majority of cost and benefits tables/assessments found in section 32 assessments. It is noted however that detail has been provided on the costs incurred by the applicant through the consent process and this provides a clearly significant disadvantage as compared to a "normal" consent regime for greenfield residential development. The one amendment that is proposed is for the Costs/disadvantages for Option 2. The reference to potential for reduced consistency in house design should also include a potential reduction of housing typologies and in particular with multi-unit typologies.

10. **Comparison table of Standards applying the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay area and the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone** - attached

Patricia Harte and Mark Brown

Comparison of standards

Meadowlands Exemplar zone rules	RNN zone rules	Key differences
<p>8.6.13 Neighbourhood plan Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay (North Halswell)</p> <p>a. A Neighbourhood Plan shall consist of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Context and Site Analysis ii. Detailed Design Statement iii. Neighbourhood Plan Set <p>b. Context and Site Analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Details the key existing elements and influences in the vicinity of the proposed development and explains the relationship of the comprehensive subdivision consent and land use consent application area to the surrounding area. ii. The Context and Site Analysis is required to include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. topography, natural and built environment features, views and vistas; B. adjacent land use zoning and land use including required setbacks from adjacent activities and interfaces where buffers will be required; C. subdivision pattern, internal access and block layout; 	<p>There is no equivalent within RNN requiring the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>The concept of the Neighbourhood Plan effectively replaces the built form standards of RNN.</p> <p>The theory behind this approach is inherently linked to the comprehensive nature of the Meadowlands Exemplar zone package. By undertaking all building within a development block – effects can be mitigated by design. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlooking is limited by design via the placement of windows within each dwelling • Shadowing is mitigated by identifying building platforms on each lot <p>Layered into this approach are exemplar design initiatives such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the dominance of vehicles by creating rear lane access • Having minimum and maximum setbacks that create street-front activation • Creating a ‘front-door’ and pedestrian linkages via edge lanes that extend along a central reserve • Creating living streets and community gardens <p>Finally more fixed elements are included such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of housing typologies – standalone, terrace, duplex and apartment. • Front yard landscape treatments • Movement networks which identify road

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. existing and potential vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist access points (including natural desire lines), parking areas and potential connections through the site; E. public open space and publicly accessible space; F. Wāhi taonga, wāhi tapu and urupā location of community facilities (shops, schools, sports and cultural facilities, etc); G. existing and proposed public transport routes and stops, and public access ways from the bus stops to the site; H. movement networks including vehicle, cycle and pedestrian routes; I. protected buildings, places and objects, protected trees, historic heritage; J. archaeological sites; K. recognition of Ngāi Tahu cultural values, history and identity associated with specific places; L. character and other existing buildings and structures; M. site orientation, including a north point on the plans; N. existing trees and landscaping to be retained; 		<p style="text-align: right;">types, parking areas and pavement materials</p> <p>As discussed in the Plan Change request, the Meadowlands Exemplar approach is entirely predicated on a comprehensive development approach. At the time the Exemplar package become Operative and for a significant time thereafter, there was no uptake for this development initiative.</p> <p>The Plan Change request clearly identifies the various attempts to roll out the exemplar approach via the non-complying subdivision and land use consent pathway.</p> <p>A further aspect to the Exemplar as outlined in Rule 8.6.13 is how the Exemplar approach failed to gain traction within Council. The aforementioned aspects that were encapsulated within the Neighbourhood Plan (edge lanes, living streets, central link reserves, rear lanes etc...) did not quite align with what various departments within Council would inherit through the vesting process. Such matters, although forming a central aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan, were modified or dispensed of through the subsequent consent process that ensued.</p>
--	--	--

<p>O. hazardous features, such as areas of soil contamination, unstable land and overhead power lines; and</p> <p>P. climatic conditions including prevailing winds.</p> <p>c. Detailed Design Statement must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. An overall vision statement for the site which identifies key deliverables/outcomes which may be linked to Resource Management Act 1991 outcomes (objectives and policies) or site specific outcomes (giving a clear steer to buyers and developers that these outcomes would be secured via covenants or other binding mechanisms).ii. An analysis in support of the overall development structure provided by the Outline Development Plan, and more refined development proposal for the area that is covered by the Neighbourhood Plan including urban form, movement network, open space, and infrastructure.iii. An analysis of allotment arrangement, size and allocation of defined housing typologies. The Neighbourhood Plan should contain sufficient analysis to demonstrate that relevant development standards in the subdivision and residential chapters can be met (notably those related to daylight and outdoor living space).		
---	--	--

<p>d. Neighbourhood Plan Set. A set of plans to accompany the detailed design statement including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Allotment arrangement B. Allotment size C. Allocation of housing typologies D. Landscaping E. Shading Analysis F. Movement network (including cross sections) G. Infrastructure (including cross sections) H. Open Space 		
<p>Buildings shown in the comprehensive subdivision and land use consent application shall meet the following built form standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum height of any building: 11m. • Maximum number of storeys for buildings: 3. • Minimum number of storeys for residential buildings facing the Key Activity Centre: 2. 	<p>14.12.2.1 Building height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All buildings except as specified below - 8.0m ii. Comprehensive residential development on any site that meets Rule 14.12.2.17 – 11.0m 	<p>Given the Exemplar framework is designed as a comprehensive development, these standards are similar.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No equivalent RNN Standard</p>	<p>Refer to commentary above in regards to Rule 8.6.13</p>
<p>8.5.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities</p> <p>RD15 The comprehensive subdivision and land use consent application shall be:</p> <p>for a developable area of at least 7000m² within the 8ha Neighbourhood Plan area; and</p>	<p>14.12.2.17 Comprehensive residential developments - development site area</p> <p>a. The minimum area of any comprehensive residential development site shall be 6000m².</p>	<p>Although the comprehensive block sizes are somewhat similar, this is where the similarities end. Exemplar development occurs via the Neighbourhood Plan (Rule 8.6.13), whereas within RNN, comprehensive development has its own set of built form standards.</p>

<p>in accordance with the outline development plan in Appendix 8.10.4A, except that:</p> <p>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.</p>		
<p>The comprehensive subdivision and land use consent application may include future development allotments.</p> <p>The comprehensive subdivision and land use consent application shall contain 3 or more of the following building typologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standalone • House; • Duplex; • Terrace; • Apartment; <p>with no single typology making up more than two thirds of the total number of residential units.</p> <p>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 and activity standard specified in Rule 8.6.8(e)</p>	<p>14.15.36 Comprehensive residential development in the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, these are the only matters of discretion that apply to comprehensive residential development in the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the comprehensive residential development is consistent with the relevant outline development plan. b. Whether the comprehensive residential development demonstrates that every site or residential unit will experience appropriate levels of sunlight, daylight, privacy, outlook and access to outdoor open space and overall a high level of amenity for the development. c. Whether sites proposed to exceed the maximum site coverage in Rule 14.12.2.2 are internal to the application site and will not compromise the achievement of a high level of amenity within or beyond the 	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan directs comprehensive development within the Exemplar. Comprehensive development within RNN is directed by the matters of discretion contained within 14.15.36.</p> <p>There are similarities in the intended outcomes anticipated within the matters of discretion and outcomes that are directed by the Neighbourhood Plan, however as discussed in the plan change request, limited comprehensive development has occurred under Exemplar conditions.</p>

	<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">d. Whether buildings proposed to exceed the maximum permitted height in Rule 14.12.2.1 will contribute positively to the overall coherence, design, layout and density of the development and surrounding sites.e. Whether the development engages with and contributes to adjacent streets, lanes and public open spaces, through the building orientation and setback, boundary and landscape treatment, pedestrian entrances, and provision of glazing from living areas.f. Whether the development, in terms of its built form and design, generates visual interest through the separation of buildings, variety in building form and in the use of architectural detailing, glazing, materials, and colour;g. Whether the development integrates access, parking areas and garages to provide for pedestrian and cyclist safety and the quality of the pedestrian environment, and the access, parking areas and garages does not dominate the development, particularly when viewed from the street or other public spaces;h. Whether there is sufficient infrastructure provision to service the development and ensure the health and safety of residents, visitors and neighbouring properties, including water supply for fire fighting purposes; and	
--	--	--

	<p>i. In relation to the built form standards that do not apply to comprehensive residential developments, consideration of these standards as a flexible guideline to achieve good design and residential amenity.</p>	
<p>No equivalent Exemplar Standard</p> <p>The 'Statement of Commitment' that is referenced in RD15 contains a density target of between 15-18hh/ha. No other subdivision standards nor density requirements are referenced within Chapter 8</p>	<p>8.6.1 Minimum net site area and dimension</p> <p>Allotments in the Residential New Neighbourhoods Zone shall meet the applicable standards at 8.6.11.</p> <p>8.6.11 Additional standards for the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone</p> <p>A subdivision shall achieve a minimum net density within residential development areas of 15 households per hectare</p> <p>Net Site Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corner allotments - Minimum 400m² • All other allotments - Minimum 300m² except that 20% of allotments in the subdivision may be 180 – 299m² in size • Comprehensive residential development - Nil <p>Minimum allotments dimension</p> <p>The standards below do not apply in respect of comprehensive residential developments.</p> <p>Corner allotments shall have a minimum dimension of 14m on road boundaries (each boundary) except where (iii) applies.</p> <p>Allotments for terrace developments shall have a</p>	<p>The control of subdivision is restricted to the Neighbourhood Plan and forms part of the comprehensive development approach whereby boundaries are informed by building type, as opposed to the standard approach of creating boundaries first.</p> <p>The majority of subdivision activity has occurred via a non-complying consent pathway which has followed standard land development practise and created titles and boundaries first.</p>

	<p>minimum dimension of 7m except for corner sites and end sites which shall have a minimum width of 10m.</p> <p>All residential allotments with a boundary shared with public open space shall have a minimum dimension along that boundary of 10m except mid-block terrace allotments which shall have a minimum dimension along that boundary of 7m.</p> <p>All other allotments, other than access or rear allotments, shall have a minimum dimension of 10m on road boundaries.</p>	
--	--	--