

	<p>Resource Management Act 1991 Christchurch District Plan Private Plan Change 11 Section 32 Evaluation and AEE</p>	<p>11</p>
<p>a) INCLUSION OF THE PROPERTY AT 254 FITZGERALD AVENUE, RICHMOND IN THE EDGE HOUSING OVERLAY SHOWN ON THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN APPENDIX 13.14.6.1 OF THE DISTRICT PLAN. AND</p> <p>b) INCLUSION OF THE PROPERTY AT 5 HARVEY TERRACE, RICHMOND, IN APPENDIX 13.14.6.2 OF THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE ŌTĀKARO AVON RIVER CORRIDOR ZONE, WITH AN ALTERNATIVE ZONING OF RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM DENSITY</p> <p>Overview</p> <p>The following report has been prepared by the applicant in support of their request for a plan change to the Christchurch District Plan, which proposes to include the land at 254 Fitzgerald Avenue in the Edge Housing Overlay and 5 Harvey Terrace, Richmond, Christchurch into Appendix 13.14.6.2 of the Specific Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor (SPOARC) Zone with an alternative zoning of Residential Medium Density. The effect of this change would be to enable the properties to be developed for medium density housing under the proposed provisions.</p> <p>This report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 32 (s 32) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).</p> <p>The purpose of this change is to enable the application site to be developed for medium density housing. The site is at the edge of the Specific Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Zone. It is separated from the river to the west by Fitzgerald Avenue, which is a 4-lane major arterial road, and to the south by Harvey Terrace and a wide strip of open land. The properties adjoin existing properties to the north and east which are zoned and occupied for medium density and low-medium density housing. The properties are privately owned.</p> <p>The purposes of the river corridor zone are primarily for the redevelopment of earthquake damaged land along the river corridor for recreation access to the river, as well as landscape and ecological enhancement and cultural purposes. The zone also allows for residential use and development of a number of privately owned properties specified in the Appendix, and for small areas of “Edge” and “Trial” housing. Because of their location the application site is not considered to be ideally suitable for the primary purposes of the zone, but very suitable for medium density housing. However, it is appropriate to retain the site in the zone to ensure its development complements the values of the river corridor.</p>		

Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose of this report	3
2	Resource Management Issues	3
2.1	Legal obligations and strategic planning documents.....	3
2.2	Problem definition - the issues being addressed.....	5
3	Development of the plan change	6
3.1	Background.....	6
3.2	Current Christchurch District Plan provisions.....	7
3.3	Description and scope of the changes proposed.....	7
3.4	Community/Stakeholder engagement.....	7
4	Scale and significance evaluation.....	7
4.1	The degree of shift in the provisions.....	7
5	Evaluation of the proposal.....	8
5.1	Statutory evaluation.....	8
5.2	Evaluation of the purpose of the plan change.....	8
5.3	Reasonably practicable options.....	10
5.4	Evaluation of options for provisions	10
6	Evaluation of the preferred option for provisions	13
6.2	Assessment of proposed rules.....	13
6.3	The most appropriate option	16
7	Conclusions	16
	APPENDIX 1 - ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.....	17
	APPENDIX 2 – GEOTECHNICAL REPORT.....	18
	APPENDIX 3 – LANDSCAPE AND URBAN DESIGN REPORT.....	19

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1.1 The overarching purpose of section 32 (s32) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) is to ensure that plans are developed using sound evidence and rigorous policy analysis, leading to more robust and enduring provisions.
- 1.1.2 Section 32 requires that the applicant provides an evaluation of the changes proposed in a request for a Plan Change to the Christchurch District Plan (the Plan). The evaluation must examine whether the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, and whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Plan. The report must consider reasonably practicable options and assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives. This will involve identifying and assessing the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects anticipated from implementing the provisions. The report must also assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.
- 1.1.3 The purpose of this report is to fulfil the s32 requirements for proposed Plan Change 11 -. In addition, the report examines any relevant directions from the statutory context including higher order documents and provides an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) in Appendix 1.

2 Resource Management Issues

2.1 Legal obligations and strategic planning documents

- 2.1.1 Section 73(2) of the RMA and Clause 21, Part 2 of Schedule 1 provide for private requests for changes to a district plan. Clause 22 of Schedule 1 sets out the requirements for what a plan change request must address and contain, including an explanation of the purpose of and reasons for the plan change request, a section 32 evaluation report and an assessment of environmental effects which takes into account the provisions of Schedule 4, clauses 6 and 7.
- 2.1.2 Sections 74 and 75 of the RMA set out legal obligations when changing a District Plan. Consideration needs to be given to whether the plan change accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under Section 31 of the RMA to, among other things, achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated resources. This includes the control of the actual and potential effects of land use or development on the environment in accordance with the provisions of Part 2 while recognising and providing for Section 6 matters, having particular regard to Section 7 matters, and taking into account Section 8 matters.
- 2.1.3 As required by s74 and s75 of the RMA, a Plan Change must specifically give effect to, not be inconsistent with, take into account, or have regard to the following "higher order" documents / provisions which provide directions for the issues relevant to this plan change.
- a. National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020
 - i. As set out in the accompanying Assessment of Environmental Effects, Objective 3 of the NPSUD requires the Christchurch City Council to provide sufficient land that is enabled for anticipated residential development. Policy 3 requires that within Central City Zones or walkable distance of them, as this site is, such residential development should be enabled to be constructed to 6 stories.

- ii. Policy 4 provides an exception for this, where there exists what are described as qualifying matters. These are explained more specifically in clauses 3.32 and 3.33. In summary qualifying matters include areas that may be unsuitable for such intense development. It is probable that the presence of the Avon River corridor in close proximity, as well as the existence of soft soils suitable for only light weight construction, as discussed in the accompanying geotechnical assessment, could amount to a qualifying matter. In any case the NPS is yet to be implemented by the Christchurch City Council through district plan changes. Overall, it is considered that the NPSUD is encouraging of higher density residential development in this area but not yet in a determinative manner, i.e., one that must be implemented. There is nothing in the NPSUD which deals specifically with the Avon River Corridor Zone, or similar areas.
 - iii. This proposal would assist in a small way to the provision of additional housing, so is consistent with Objective 3.
 - iv. It is therefore concluded that little weight needs to be given to the NPSUD for the purposes of this plan change.
- b. Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)
- i. Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement deals with earthquake recovery.
 - ii. Issue 1 of the RPS – Enabling Recovery, Rebuilding and Development is

How to provide certainty to the community and businesses around how Greater Christchurch will accommodate expected population and household relocation and growth, housing needs and economic activity during the recovery period in an efficient and environmentally sustainable manner. This includes providing for a diverse community with a range of incomes, needs and business types.

Issue 2 - Adverse Effects Arising from Development states that

Development can result in adverse effects on the environment, which if not identified and avoided, remedied, or mitigated where appropriate, could result in inappropriate outcomes for the region's natural and physical resources, and reduce Greater Christchurch's resilience and ability to provide for the needs of people and communities.

Objective 6.2.1 is seeking that

Recovery, rebuilding, and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework.

Objective 6.2.2 Urban form and settlement pattern seeks that

The urban form and settlement pattern in Greater Christchurch is managed to provide sufficient land for rebuilding and recovery needs and set a foundation for future growth, with an urban form that achieves consolidation and intensification of urban areas, and avoids unplanned expansion of urban areas, by, among other matters:

2. *providing higher density living environments including mixed use developments and a greater range of housing types, particularly in and around the Central City,*

Objective 6.2.3 seeks

6.2.3 Sustainable Recovery and rebuilding is undertaken in Greater Christchurch that:

1. *provides for quality living environments incorporating good urban design;*
2. *retains identified areas of special amenity and historic heritage value;*
3. *retains values of importance to Tāngata Whenua;*

4. provides a range of densities and uses; and

5. is healthy, environmentally sustainable, functionally efficient, and prosperous

Policy 6.3.1-Development within the Greater Christchurch provides a framework for urban development within the Greater Christchurch Metropolitan area, including a Map showing where substantial new development is to occur.

Overall, it is considered the RPS deals with urban development at a high level, metropolitan scale. The RPS is implemented by the territorial local authorities through their district plans. The Christchurch City Council has been prepared in the light of the RPS and gives effect to it.

It is concluded that this application is broadly consistent with these key provisions of the RPS, but that there is nothing in the RPS which is specific enough to give detailed guidance as the outcome of the application, so little weight needs to be given to it for the purposes of this plan change application. The Christchurch District Plan is the more appropriate vehicle to consider a small-scale local proposal such as this one.

c. The Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration Plan

This plan was prepared by the Crown and the Christchurch City Council to set out a vision for the use of the land along the Avon River corridor that was severely affected by the Canterbury earthquakes. It identifies a number of subareas within the corridor where specific projects are intended, as well as accesses into and along the corridor. Several sites are identified for Edge Housing and Trial Housing Areas. The application site is not identified as part of any of these subarea or projects, but instead is included in the general Green Spine.

As discussed in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (the AEE) which is attached in Appendix 1, which should be read together with this section 32 Assessment, the application site does not strongly reflect the core values and opportunities the Regeneration Plan seeks to protect and promote. As discussed in the Landscape and Urban Design Report the proposed development will have no more than minor, and in most cases negligible effects on the values and specific proposals promoted by the Regeneration Plan and would provide a more appropriate edge to the river corridor than the present rather irregular boundary in this location. The application is therefore consistent with the Regeneration Plan.

2.1.4 No other management plans or strategies prepared under other Acts are relevant to the resource management issue identified.

2.1.5 As mentioned above, the RMA prescribes certain requirements for how district plans are to align with other instruments. Whether the District Plan objectives and provisions relevant to them do that will be discussed in section 5.1 of the report.

2.2 Problem definition - the issues being addressed

2.2.1 ISSUE 1 - A small block of privately owned vacant land at 254 Fitzgerald Avenue and 5 Harvey Terrace is within the Specific Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Zone. The land is not proposed to be developed for the primary purposes of that zone by any public authority. The owner has no interest in carrying out such development and wishes to develop it for housing. This is not currently provided for by the provisions of the zone.

2.2.2 ISSUE 2 – Development under the present zoning provisions would require resource consent applications for non-complying activities at each stage, with significant expense and uncertainty, due to aspects of the relevant objectives and policies which could count against such

applications, as outlined in the accompanying Assessment of Environmental effects. The owners do not wish to undertake this without greater certainty.

- 2.2.3 The desired outcome would not require a revision of objectives, or policies, and only minor technical adjustments to rules. All that is required is the insertion of the two application sites respectively in the Edge Housing Overlay in Appendix 13.14.6.1, and the table of privately owned properties in Appendix 13.14.6.2 of the District Plan with an alternative zoning of Residential Medium Density, and the insertion of rules to ensure that access to the proposed new dwellings as a permitted activity is restricted to the Harvey Tce frontage. This will enable the applicant to undertake its proposed developments under the already existing rules, in exactly the same manner as other similar sites that are already listed in the Appendices.

3 Development of the plan change

3.1 Background

- 3.1.1 The resource management issues set out above have been identified through the assessment of the current district plan relevant to the issues and other documents relating to the Ōtākaro River corridor, such as the Ōtākaro River Regeneration Plan.
- 3.1.2 The situation has arisen through the applicant's desire to erect a new dwelling on the land at 254 Fitzgerald Avenue next door to its existing 4 unit apartment block dwelling at No 256, and the opportunity to acquire the adjacent land at No 5 Harvey Terrace from the Crown.
- 3.1.3 The current provisions in the District Plan have arisen because of the Canterbury Earthquakes when large areas of land, including the application sites along the lower reaches of the Avon River and in other parts of Christchurch were badly affected, particularly by liquefaction and lateral slumping towards the river. A large number of buildings were damaged beyond economic repair. The land was declared by the Government to be a "red zone". The affected owners were given an offer of purchase by the Crown, which most but not all accepted, and most but not all of the red zone was cleared. This presented an opportunity for redeveloping the river corridor for the as an environmental, recreational, and cultural asset. When the district plan was reviewed the affected land was given a zoning of Specific Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor.
- 3.1.4 The provisions of this zone largely reflect the new primary purposes of this zone, but provision was made for the retention of remaining privately owned houses and limited numbers of new dwellings through the rules, as described in the overview above and in the AEE document in Appendix 1. The application properties were not included in either the Edge Housing Overlay or the table of existing privately owned properties in the zone created by the new zone provisions, because at the time they were not owned by the applicant. However, they are generally very similar to properties nearby which have been identified for those purposes.
- 3.1.5 The suitability for housing of the application sites has been improved by the construction by the Council of a large retaining wall along the riverbank on the opposite side of Fitzgerald Avenue which has reduced the potential for lateral slumping, as discussed in the attached geotechnical report in Appendix 2.
- 3.1.6 Technical advice from various experts has been commissioned to assist with assessing the existing environment/issues and the potential effects of the proposal on the environment, as well as the potential options for mitigating the adverse effects. This advice includes the following:

Table 1: Technical Reports informing Plan Change XX

	Title	Author	Description of Report
a.	Geotechnical Assessment		Geotechnical conditions/ land contamination/ remediation requirements/ costs
b.	Visual Amenity		Assessment of visual and other amenity effects on the existing/ neighbouring environment (urban design, setbacks, landscaping, glare etc.)

3.2 Current Christchurch District Plan provisions

3.2.1 The current Plan's Strategic Directions objectives, chapter objectives and provisions relevant to this plan change are set out and discussed in the AEE which is attached as Appendix 1.

3.2.2 The rules provide do not provide for the applicant's proposal as a permitted controlled, restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.

3.3 Description and scope of the changes proposed

3.3.1 The Plan Change does not propose any changes to the objectives and policies of the Plan.

3.3.2 The purpose of the Plan Change proposal is to enable the properties to remain in the Specific Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Zone and to be developed for housing under the provisions of the Edge Housing Overlay and the Residential Medium Density (RMD) Zone. The plan change proposes to do this by the insertion of the property at 254 Fitzgerald Avenue in the Edge Housing Overlay and the property at 5 Harvey Terrace in the Table in Appendix 13.14.6.2 with an alternative zoning of Residential Medium Density.

3.4 Community/Stakeholder engagement

3.4.1 No consultation has been undertaken with any parties.

4 Scale and significance evaluation

4.1 The degree of shift in the provisions

4.1.1 The level of detail in the evaluation of the proposal has been determined by the degree of shift of the scale of effects anticipated from the proposal.

4.1.2 The degree of shift in the provisions from the status quo is not significant as the proposal is very localised and the outcomes will only be perceptible in the near vicinity of the sites, for example passers-by who will have a very brief view of the sites, and immediate neighbours who will be more aware of the new dwellings proposed to be constructed. As these will be modern dwellings constructed in accordance with the RMD zone provisions, and as the amount of open space in the vicinity will remain very large, the effects on the amenities of those neighbours are considered to be low.

4.1.3 The degree of shift in the provisions is therefore considered to be very low.

4.1.4 The scale and significance of the likely effects anticipated from the implementation of the proposal has also been evaluated. The initial assessment of the environmental effects anticipated has been verified by the specialist advice obtained. It is considered that the effects of the proposal:

- a. Will result in effects that have been considered, implicitly or explicitly, by higher order documents,
- b. Are of localised significance and will have localised impact,
- c. Will affect a very limited number of individual property owners in the immediate vicinity and have low impact on private properties,
- d. Will contribute to the City's recovery,
- e. Will have positive effects,
- f. Will not impose significant costs on individuals or communities.

5 Evaluation of the proposal

5.1 Statutory evaluation

5.1.1 Refer to section 2.1 above and the Assessment of Environmental Effects (see Appendix 1) for the evaluation of relevant statutory documents.

5.2 Evaluation of the purpose of the plan change

5.2.1 Section 32 requires an evaluation of the extent to which the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act (s 32(1)(a))

5.2.2 The existing objectives of the operative Christchurch District Plan are not proposed to be altered or added to by this Plan Change. This report, therefore, evaluates the extent to which the purpose of the Plan Change is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

5.2.3 The evaluation, therefore, examines whether:

- a. the purpose of the plan change (s32(6)(b)) is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act (s32(1)(a));
- b. the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the plan change (refer to section 5.3 below) and
- c. the provisions in the proposal implement the unaltered objectives of the District Plan (refer to section 5.3 below). One alternative purpose is also evaluated. [s75(1)].

5.2.4 The following table provides an evaluation of the purpose of the proposed Plan Change as well as an alternative purpose of retaining the status quo to establish which is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act (s32(1)(a) and s32(6)(b)).

Purpose of the proposal	Summary of Evaluation
<p><i>Purpose of the Plan Change as proposed</i></p> <p>The purpose of the Plan Change proposal is to enable the properties to remain in the Specific Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Zone and to be developed for Edge Housing medium density</p>	<p>a. <i>The intent of the Plan Change is to facilitate development of a small site at the fringe of the Avon River corridor, and to increase the supply of housing in Christchurch consistent with Objective 3 of the NPSUD, Objective 6.2.2 of the Regional Policy Statement Objective 13.14.2.1(b) of the Christchurch District Plan.</i></p> <p>b. <i>The implementation of the plan change will provide for a level of amenity that will be appropriate for both the</i></p>

<p>housing under the provisions of the Edge Housing Overlay and the Residential Medium Density Zone.</p>	<p><i>adjacent medium density residential and the river corridor environments, and</i></p> <p><i>c. The proposal seeks to address the following resource management issues identified earlier, namely:</i></p> <p><i>i. Issue 1, the unlikelihood of the sites being developed for the primary purposes of the SPOARC zone in the foreseeable future, and</i></p> <p><i>ii. Issue 2, the ongoing costs and uncertainty for the owners to be able to develop the sites for residential purposes through applying for resource consents.</i></p> <p><i>d. The proposed Plan Change would promote the sustainable management purpose of Section 5 of the RMA by:</i></p> <p><i>i. Enabling development of housing in a locality already allocated for that purpose without adversely affecting the open space and natural values of the river corridor environment.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Being consistent with the Recovery Strategy, Ōtākaro River Regeneration Plan and Chapter 6 of the CRPS.</i></p> <p><i>e. Provide for the efficient use of land as a resource</i></p> <p><i>f. There no disadvantages foreseen from this proposal</i></p>
<p><i>Alternative purpose</i></p> <p><i>Retain status quo with no changes to provisions</i></p> <p><i>The sites would remain in the SPOARC zone with no recognition of their privately owned status</i></p>	<p><i>a. The current, unchanged rules do not provide any opportunity for alternative development under the rules. No development for the primary purposes of the zone would be likely to be undertaken by either the owners or the Council and if the owners wished to carry out development, they would need to apply for non-complying activity resource consents. The land potentially could remain an open area of grass for the foreseeable future, and a maintenance liability for the owner.</i></p> <p><i>Retaining the status quo would (in the context of Part 2 matters):</i></p> <p><i>b. not be inconsistent with the higher order documents or the objectives of the district plan, but</i></p> <p><i>c. not provide any positive benefits for the owners, the public or the natural environment.....</i></p>
<p>Summary of evaluation:</p> <p><i>The plan change purpose is the most consistent with the Plan objectives and higher order directions and will best achieve them. Retaining the status quo would not resolve the issues identified in 2.2</i></p>	

5.2.5 The above analysis indicates that the purpose of the Plan Change implements the Plan objectives and higher order directions. These promote an increased supply of medium density housing in Christchurch, the development of the Avon River corridor for environmental, ecological, recreational and cultural purposes but also allow for limited development of housing in selected

areas including on land in the SPOARC zone retained by private owners. By comparison, the alternative purpose of retaining the status quo would not resolve the issues outlined earlier, implement the relevant objectives in full or be fully consistent with the relevant higher order documents, and would not achieve the purpose of the Act.

5.2.6 It is, therefore, considered that the purpose of the Plan Change is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

5.2.7 In establishing the most appropriate provisions for the proposal to achieve the purpose of the plan change, reasonably practicable options for provisions were identified and evaluated.

5.3 Reasonably practicable options

5.3.1 In considering reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives of the Plan and any relevant higher order directions, the following options have been identified. Considering the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects, the options identified were assessed in terms of their benefits, and costs. Based on that, the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the alternative options was assessed.

5.3.2 Option 1 – Status quo. The sites would be retained in the SPOARC zone without inclusion in Appendix 13.4.6.2 or the Edge Housing Overlay. Any development for purposes other than the primary purposes of the zone would necessitate successfully obtaining a resource consent or consents. Such consents would be non-complying activities. If development proceeded in stages, this process would need to be repeated for each stage.

5.3.3 Option 2 – The sites would be rezoned as Residential Medium Density. Opportunity would be taken to include the site at 256 Fitzherbert St as RMD.

5.3.4 Option 3 – The sites would be rezoned as Residential Suburban Density Transitional.

5.3.5 Option 4 – Proposed Plan Change. Include the application site at 5 Harvey Tce in Appendix 13.14.6.2 and the site at 254 Fitzgerald Avenue in the Edge Housing Overlay.

5.4 Evaluation of options for provisions

5.4.1 The policies of the proposal must implement the objectives of the District Plan (s75(1)(b)), and the rules are to implement the policies of the District Plan (s75(1)(c)).

5.4.2 In addition, rule [is to be examined as to whether it is the most appropriate way for achieving the purpose [s32(6)(b)] of the plan change (s32(1)(b)).

5.4.3 Before providing a detailed evaluation of the rules proposed *in* the plan change, the alternative options identified have been considered in terms of their potential costs and benefits and overall appropriateness in achieving the objectives of the Plan and the relevant directions of the higher order documents].

5.4.4 The tables below summarise the assessment of costs and benefits for each option based on their anticipated environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects. The assessments are supported by the information obtained through technical reports, consultation, etc.

5.4.5 The overall effectiveness and efficiency of each option has been evaluated, as well as the risks of acting or not acting.

5.4.6 Option 1 - Status quo

Benefits	Appropriateness in achieving the objectives/ higher order document directions
Environmental:	Efficiency:

The land would remain in open space, and if maintained well it would not detract from the local landscape.	<p>This option would be unable to achieve the objectives of the higher order documents or the district plan in full.</p> <p>It would not achieve any positive environmental, recreational or cultural benefits, or any economic activities.</p> <p>It would not provide for residential activities on the privately owned land, as promoted by policy 13.14.2.1.4 of the District Plan.</p> <p>It would not provide an appropriate edge to residential land. At best it would see the land retained as a vacant and passive piece of open space.</p> <p>Therefore, this is not regarded as an efficient option.</p> <p>Effectiveness</p> <p>This option would not be effective in achieving any of the desired outcomes for the zone unless the Council acquires the land.</p>
Economic: Nil	
Social: Nil	
Cultural: Nil	
Costs	
Environmental: Nil, unless the land is poorly maintained.	
Economic: Loss of economic return for owners and developers.	
Social: Loss of a small supply of housing	
Cultural: Nil	
Risk of acting/not acting	
<p>The risk of the identified costs and benefits occurring is considered to be high, while noting that some of these costs and benefits are relatively minor.</p>	
<p>Recommendation: This option is not recommended as it is considered the only benefit would be the retention of a small area of privately-owned land in undeveloped open space, and the cost to the owners and the community would exceed this benefit.</p>	

5.4.7 Option 2 – Rezone subject sites and 256 Fitzgerald Avenue as Residential Medium Density

Benefits	Appropriateness in achieving the objectives/ higher order document directions
<p>Environmental:</p> <p>An appropriate edge would be provided to the river corridor along Fitzgerald Avenue and Harvey Terrace. An increased supply of housing would occur.</p>	<p>Efficiency:</p> <p>This option would be highly effective in achieving the objectives and policies of the higher order documents and the district plan.</p>
<p>Economic:</p> <p>Economic benefits would result from the increased supply of housing to the present</p>	

and future owners and occupiers, and to the construction industry.	Effectiveness: This option would be effective in achieving the objectives of the higher order documents and the district plan.
Social: An increased supply of housing	
Cultural: Nil	
Costs	
Environmental: Loss of opportunity to develop the sites for the primary purposes of the SPOARC zone	
Economic: Nil	
Social: Nil	
Cultural: Nil	
Risk of acting/not acting This option would have similar outcomes to the option applied for, but without the opportunity for enhanced landscaping at the corner of Fitzgerald Avenue and Harvey Terrace to provide a visual transition towards the river corridor.	
Recommendation: This option is not recommended as it is considered that attention should be drawn to the proximity of the river corridor zone when preparing and assessing plans for future development. However, there is a very narrow margin between this option and the option applied for	

5.4.8 Option 3 – Rezone subject sites and 256 Fitzgerald Avenue as Residential Suburban Density Transitional

Benefits	Appropriateness in achieving the objectives/ higher order document directions
Environmental: An appropriate edge would be provided to the river corridor along Fitzgerald Avenue and Harvey Terrace. An increased supply of housing would occur.	Efficiency: This option would be efficient in achieving the objectives and policies of the higher order documents and the district plan, although not to the same extent as the preferred option.
Economic: Economic benefits would result from the increased supply of housing to the present	

and future owners and occupiers, and to the construction industry.	Effectiveness: This option would be moderately effective in achieving the objectives of the higher order documents and the district plan.
Social: Increased housing supply	
Cultural: Nil	
Costs	
Environmental: Loss of opportunity to develop the sites for the primary purposes of the SPOARC zone. This is regarded as a minor cost only as the site is not necessary or completely suitable for the primary outcomes sought by the zone as discussed in the Assessment of Effects	
Economic: Nil	
Social: Nil	
Cultural: Nil	
Risk of acting/not acting This option would have very similar outcomes to the option applied for, with potentially a lesser level of housing development. There would be little risk, as the social and economic benefits outweigh the costs by a significant margin.	
Recommendation: This option is not recommended as it is considered that the benefits would be less than Option 2 or the preferred option.	

- 5.4.9 Summing up, Option 1 is not considered to be efficient or effective, and Options 2 and 3 are not considered as efficient and effective in achieving the objectives of the Plan and the relevant directions of higher order documents as the preferred option.
- 5.4.10 The detailed evaluation of Option 4, the preferred option, follows.

6 Evaluation of the preferred option for provisions

- 6.1.1 Option 2 is the proposed plan change, which is to include the application site in Appendix 13.14.6.2 with an alternative zoning of Residential Medium Density.
- 6.2 Assessment of proposed rules
- 6.2.1 The proposed amendments to Appendix 13.14.6.2 insert the site at 5 Harvey Terrace property into the Appendix with alternative zoning of residential Medium Density, in order to achieve the

opportunity of medium density residential development and the establishment of a more appropriate edge to the river corridor zone.

- 6.2.2 The proposed amendments to Appendix 13.14.6.1 insert the site at 254 Fitzgerald Avenue into the Edge Housing Overlay, which will enable a visual transition into the river corridor to the south across Harvey Terrace.
- 6.2.3 The proposed amendments to Rule 14.4.1.1 P23 and P33, Rule 13.14.4.1.3 1 RD1 and RD2, Rule 13.14.4.2.11 and Rule 13.14.4.11 ensure that access to the proposed new dwellings will be restricted to their Harvey Tce frontage, or be subject to restricted discretionary activity procedures to protect the continuity of the landscape frontage on Fitzgerald Avenue and the safety and efficiency of traffic there.

Benefits
<p>Environmental:</p> <p>An edge would be provided to the Special Purpose Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Zone which follows road boundaries, Fitzgerald Avenue and Harvey Terrace. This is considered preferable the present irregular boundary as it would be a clean, straight identifiable edge that addresses the predominantly linear form of the zone and overlooks and activates the zone. This would continue the edge as exists already to the east along Harvey Terrace.</p> <p>There would be an exception to this, immediately to the north of number 256 Fitzgerald Avenue where an isolated and vacant site owned by the Christchurch City Council would remain in the SPOARC zone but not within the Appendix. This site would be isolated from the river corridor and may also be suitable for a change in its zoning status as its contribution to the core values of the zone are probably even less than the application sites, but that would need to be promoted by the Council.</p>
<p>Economic:</p> <p>There would be economic benefits for the owners from the proposed residential development, any future owners and occupiers and the construction industry.</p>
<p>Social:</p> <p>Social benefits would arise from the housing development which would provide a small contribution to resolving the housing crisis and enable people to live in an attractive location close to the river corridor and the central city.</p>
<p>Cultural:</p> <p>No cultural benefits are foreseen.</p>

Costs
<p>Environmental:</p> <p>Loss of opportunity to develop the sites for the primary purposes of the SPOARC zone. This is regarded as a negligible cost only as the site is not necessary or completely suitable for the primary outcomes sought by the zone as discussed in the Assessment of Effects and not likely to be developed for those purposes anyway. It is noted also that the Council is likely to have much more significant priorities for regeneration in the zone.</p>
<p>Economic:</p>

Nil
<p>Social:</p> <p>Some potential amenity effects for immediate neighbours in Harvey Tce who will experience residential neighbours rather than open space. These will be mitigated through the application of the RMD rules and will be less than minor, or any developments will be limited notified to them under the rules.</p>
<p>Cultural:</p> <p>Nil</p>

- 6.2.4 This proposed amendment to the rules will enable this privately owned land to be developed for an appropriate purpose, medium density housing, without adversely affecting the amenities of the river corridor, both as they exist at present and as they will exist in future as the Ōtākaro River Regeneration Plan continues to be implemented. In particular it will provide an appropriate edge to the river corridor which will activate and overlook it, increasing usage and security there. This option will provide the private owners an economic option for the use of their land and increase the likelihood of it not remaining vacant and becoming a maintenance burden. This option is marginally more efficient and effective than Options 2 and 3, because it would maintain the awareness of the river corridor and the need to protect its amenities when undertaking development. It is far more efficient than Option 1, the status quo because it removes the need for non-complying activity applications with their cost and uncertainty and which would be at least inconsistent with several aspects of the district plan objectives and policies.

Consistency with the policies and appropriateness in achieving the objectives
<p>Efficiency:</p> <p>This option will give effect very efficiently to Policy 13.14.2.1.4 - Continuation of Pre-Earthquake Activities which seeks in subclause a) to provide for <i>residential activities and other existing activities on existing properties in private ownership in the River Corridor</i>.</p> <p>This option will also be consistent with the higher order documents and with the objectives and policies of the district plan especially with Objective 13.14.2.1 – Regeneration. Part b) of this objective is that the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor supports opportunities for other uses and activities that are compatible with the priority outcomes including limited residential development on the outer edge of the Zone to improve integration between the edge of existing neighbourhoods and the activities within the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor.</p> <p>It is therefore an appropriate way to achieve this objective which is directly relevant to the properties subject to the application.</p>
<p>Effectiveness:</p> <p>This option will be effective in addressing the relevant objectives and policies which apply at the edge of the SPOARC zone and to privately owned properties in the zone.</p>
<p>Risk of acting/not acting</p> <p>The risks of acting in the proposed manner are considered to be minimal. The risk of not acting is the land may be left undeveloped, in a vacant state which would be a maintenance burden</p>

on the owners and may not be adequately maintained. Alternatively, there is a risk of placing an unnecessarily difficult consenting regime on the owners.

6.3 The most appropriate option

- 6.3.1 The option discussed in 6.2 above is the preferred option, because it is more efficient and effective in achieving those objectives and policies of the SPOARC zone which apply specifically to the edges of the zone and to privately owned properties within the zone and would have less than minor adverse effects on activities in the balance of the zone or on immediately adjoining owners and occupiers.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1.1 The conclusion is the preferred option would be the most efficient, effective and appropriate outcome for the owners of the land and the best means to achieve and give effect to the objectives and policies of the district plan.

APPENDIX 1 - ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

APPENDIX 2 – GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

APPENDIX 3 – LANDSCAPE AND URBAN DESIGN REPORT