

**PC 13 - TABLE OF REMAINING RHA RELATED SUBMISSIONS
WITH RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
ISSUE 1 – CHESTER STREET EAST RHA						
Peter Beck	S22	S22.1, S22.2	Amend	Extend the Chester Street East Residential Heritage Area to cover the entire street.		Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.55	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject
Debbie Smith	S57	S57.1, S57.4	Amend	Seeks that the entirety of Chester Street East be included as a Residential Heritage Area.		Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.92	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject

Mary Crowe	S281	S281.2	Amend	Chester Street East should receive heritage protection zoning for the whole length of the street.		Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values	
Fire and Emergency NZ	S842	S842.48 S842.75- .77, S842.79, S842.81, S842.82.	Amend	Request that the boundaries of RHA2 are reduced to exclude the Fire and Emergency City Station site at 91 Chester Street East.		Accept in part, with the extent of inclusion of the FENZ site at 91 Chester St East being reduced to 5m from the Chester Street road boundary of the site.	
			Oppose	Ensure that 91 Chester Street East is not subject to these RHA rules.		Accept in part, As the FENZ site at 91 Chester Street East should only be included for 5m from the ChesterStreet road boundary of the site.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose		
			FS2084.3 (S842.81)	Christian Jordan	Oppose		Accept in part
Kirsten Rupp	S1001	S1001.1, S1001.2	Amend	All of Chester Street East be included in the Residential Heritage Area.		Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.	
Keith Patterson	S1002	S1002.1, S1002.3	Amend	The section of Kilmore St west of Dawson St to Barbadoes St to be included in the Chester St/ Dawson Lane Residential Heritage Area.		Reject, as the section of Kilmore Street proposed for inclusion no longer has sufficient authenticity and integrity to merit being included. However the cottages at 341, 345 and 347 Barbadoes Street do warrant inclusion as an extension to the RHA, but no submission sought this.	

Ian Shaw	S1007	S1007.1	Amend	<p>Add the following areas to the Chester St heritage area:</p> <p>1: The area East of Dorset [Dawson] Street to Fitzgerald Avenue.</p> <p>2. The properties located on Kilmore Street that adjoin the heritage area of Chester Street East, e.g. the North boundaries of 129, 131 and 133 Chester Street</p>	<p>1. Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.</p> <p>2. Reject, as the section of Kilmore Street proposed for inclusion no longer has sufficient authenticity and integrity to merit being included.</p>
Simon Adamson and Judith Hudson	S1013	S1013.1, S1013.2	Amend	That Chester St East be included in the Chester Street Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Susan Parle	S1014	S1014.1, S1014.2, S1014.3	Amend	That Chester St East be included in the Chester St Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Mary Crowe	S1015	S1015.1, S1015.2	Amend	The entirety of Chester Street East should be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Waipapa Papanui-Innes- Central Community Board	S1016	S1016.1	Amend	The entire area or whole street from Chester Street East to Fitzgerald Ave be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.

Bosco Peters	S1022	S1022.1, S1022.2	Amend	That Council recognises the whole of Chester Street East as having special heritage character, and Include it in Appendix 9.3.7.3	Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.	
Oxford Terrace Baptist Church	S1052	S1052.3, S1052.4	Amend	Seek that the whole of Chester Street East be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.	
ISSUE 2 - MACMILLAN AVENUE RHA						
Daniel Rutherford	S1027	S1027.1, S1027.2	Oppose	Remove 20 Macmillan Avenue from the proposed Macmillan Avenue Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as the inclusion of 20 Macmillan Avenue maintains the integrity of the historic subdivision that underpins the heritage values of the area.	
Dr Bruce Harding	S1079	S1079.1	Amend	Seek clarification on the RHA 8 (Macmillan Avenue) boundary, as it was all covered in the Special Amenity Area provisions in the 1990s City Plan. Why is the home of John Macmillan Brown (35 Macmillan Ave) excluded.	Reject, as the portion of 35 Macmillan Avenue which includes the house is included in a Character Area(CA3).	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.662	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject

		S1079.2	Amend	Seek confirmation that homes/properties of iconic citizens (in all city RHAs) are clearly delineated in the revised City Plan— so for Cashmere, for example, “Rise Cottage” (Westenra Terrace), the Ngaio Marsh House (37 Valley Road).	Partly accept, as the properties cited are already included in the Appendix 9.3.7.2 Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.663	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support in part	
					Partly accept	
ISSUE 3 – INNER CITY WEST RHA						
Christ’s College	S699 [also covered under Issue 8]; S1060	S699.1, [RHA mapping only]; S1060.1	Oppose	Delete the RHA from the following properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armagh Street – Numbers 6, 14, 16, 20 and 22 • Gloucester Street – Numbers 4, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 19 • Rolleston Avenue – Numbers 54, 64 and 72 (excluding the Heritage Items and Setting 267 at 64 Rolleston Ave. 	Reject, As the properties in question make a significant contribution to the heritage values of the area. The Inner City West RHA is one of the few remaining pockets of larger inner city housing from the late 19th and early 20th centuries.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.544	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support in part	Reject
			FS2084.9	Christian Jordan	Oppose	Accept

Carter Group Limited	S824; S1080 [S814 was the numbering used in PC14- the content of the points is identical]	S824.21, S1080.21	Oppose	Oppose the definition for Contributory Building. Seek that this is deleted.	Reject , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.839	Kainga Ora	Support in part	Reject
		FS101.2	Johanna King for CRFU	Support	Reject	
		S824.23, S1080.23	Oppose	Oppose definition of Defining Building. Seek that it is deleted.	Reject , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.841	Kainga Ora	Support in part	Reject
			FS101.3	Johanna King for CRFU	Support	Reject

		S824.37, S1080.37	Oppose	Oppose definition of Intrusive building or site. Seek that it is deleted.		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.23	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.855	Kainga Ora	Support in part	Reject
		S824.38, S1080.38	Oppose	Oppose definition for Neutral building or site. Seek that it is deleted.		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.27	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.856	Kainga Ora	Support in part	Reject
			FS101.5	Johanna King for CRFU	Support	Reject

		S824.1, S824.24	Oppose	Oppose changes to the definitions of alterations and demolition to add reference to “heritage areas”.	Reject. This is essentially a consequential submission point from opposing all RHA provisions in S824 (see p18 below).	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS101.1, FS101.4	Johanna King for CRFU	Support Reject	
Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	S823	S823.9	Oppose	Definition of 'Contributory Building'. Delete.	Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1241	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept
			FS2045.182	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.1094	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	Accept in part

		S823.11	Oppose	Definition 'Defining building'. Delete		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1243	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept
			FS2045.184	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.10	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.1096	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	Accept in part
		S823.212	Oppose	Delete the definition of 'Neutral building or site'.		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1444	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept

			FS2045.385	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose.	Accept
			FS2082.1222	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	Accept in part
		S823.213	Oppose	Delete the definition of 'Intrusive building or site'.		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1445	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept
			FS2045.386	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.24	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.1223	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	
Elizabeth Harris and John Harris	S1061	S1061.3, S1061.4	Oppose	Seeks that the Inner City West Residential Heritage Area overlay is removed from 31 Cashel Street and		Reject, As there are significant historic, architectural and contextual heritage values in this area.

				other sites on [the north side of] Cashel Street.		
		S1061.1	Oppose	The submitter seeks that 31 Cashel Street and surrounding sites be rezoned to High Density Residential.	Accept, As these properties have already been zoned High Density Residential in PC14.	
Diana Shand	S1075	S1075.1	Amend	Supports the Inner West Residential Heritage Area and seeks that Cranmer Square be included in the Inner City West Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, as Cranmer Square is not considered integral to the heritage values of the Inner City West RHA.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.668	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject
		S1075.5 [heritage only]	Oppose	Seek that the Commercial use be confined to Oxford Terrace and that the Medium Density Zone should extend south from 59 Gloucester Street in a direct line south to the River at 75 Cambridge Terrace, displacing the Mixed Use Zone. [zoning question reported elsewhere]	Reject, As the parts of blocks described in this submission do not embody collective heritage values.	
ISSUE 4 – CHURCH PROPERTY TRUSTEES/NORTH ST ALBANS RHA						
Melissa Macfarlane	S135	S135.2	Oppose	Delete any applicable residential heritage area for the St Albans Church Properties Subdivision area.	Reject, As the area demonstrates significant historic heritage values and therefore merits scheduling as an RHA.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.8	Susan Wall	Support	Reject
			FS2035.1	Anne Talaska	Support	Reject
			FS2038.1	Nick Bristed	Support	Reject
Melissa Macfarlane	S1003	S1003.2	Amend	Amend 48 Malvern Street to a 'neutral building' rather than a 'defining building'		Reject, As alterations and alterations and additions that are currently being undertaken lead to a recommendation of 'Contributory.'
		S1003.7	Oppose	Delete HA3 from Appendix 9.3.7.3 and retain the area as a residential character area instead.		Reject, As the area demonstrates significant historic heritage values and therefore merits scheduling as an RHA.
ISSUE 5- SHELLEY/FORBES RHA						
Kate Askew	S1005	S1005.2	Support	Supports the inclusion of Heritage Areas including HA11 Shelley/Forbes Street, and own property at 11 Shelley Street.		Accept
		S1005.3	Amend	Amend Appendix 9.3.7.3 to include 10 Shelley Street as a defining building.		Reject, as it is considered that the building at 10 Shelley Street should continue to be rated as contributory.

Neil McAnulty	S1040	S1040.1, S1040.2	Oppose	Oppose the RHA as it applies to Forbes Street, Sydenham.	Reject, As the street does merit inclusion in the RHA, despite recent changes.
ISSUE 6- LYTTTELTON RHA					
Cody Cooper	S289	S289.3, S289.4	Oppose	Remove Lyttelton as a heritage area and instead pick a specific street or smaller area to designate as heritage.	Partly accept, as a reduction in extent of the Lyttelton RHA has occurred since notification.
Julie Villard	S1078	S1078.1, S1078.2	Amend	Oppose the extent of the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area. Seek that this be reduced.	Accept, as a reduction in extent of the Lyttelton RHA has occurred since notification.
Lyttelton Port Company	S1083	S1083.1, S1083.2	Support	Supports the extent of the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area as notified.	Accept, as the seaward boundary of the RHA has remained the same.
ISSUE 7- REQUESTED ADDITIONAL RHAS					
Susanne Trim	S37	[Body of submission]	Amend	Mary Street and Rayburn Avenue in Papanui are more appropriate than Heaton St to be an RHA	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.
Emma Wheeler	S206	S206.1	Amend	[New Residential Heritage Area] Make both St James Avenue and Windermere Road category 1 Streets, protecting both the plaques, trees and the people that already enjoy and use these streets	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose

			FS2037.298	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject
Dominic Mahoney	S329	S329.3, S329.4	Amend	Perry Street should not be zoned for high density residential development on the basis of its historical heritage nature		Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA
P Tucker and C Winefield	S709, S1094	S709.3 , S1094.3	Amend	Windermere Road properties should be in an RHA, with protection extended to the street and housing.		Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.
Marie Byrne	S734, S1063	S734.1, S734.2; S1063.1, S1063.2	Amend	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential area in Phillipstown, Cashel Street to Ferry Road, Bordesley Street to Nursery Road be considered for a heritage area.		Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA. However an adjoining area around Ryan Street may meet the criteria.
Susan Bye for Lower Cashmere Residents Association	S741	S741.3, S741.4	Amend	Make Cashmere View Street a heritage street.		Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA. Cashmere View Street was recommended in Council's PC14 evidence to be a Character Area, but that IHP rejected further character areas.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2082.493, FS2082.494	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept
Margaret Stewart	S755	S755.4	Amend	Add Woodville Street, St Albans		Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.

Mark Winter	S1008	S1008.1, S1008.2	Amend	Retain a heritage [and character status] for Beverley Street	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Waipapa Papanui-Innes- Central Community Board	S1016	S1016.4	Amend	Include Dover Street (original workers' cottages of historical significance) in schedule.	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Ruth Morrison	S1041	S1041.1- S1041.3	Amend	Keep the area around Paparoa St, Dormer St, Rayburn Ave and Perry St as a heritage area	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Anton Casutt	S1088	S1088.1- S1088.3	Amend	Seeks that Scott Street, Sydenham is added to a Residential Heritage Area [or Character Area].	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board	S1090	S1090.1	Amend	Supports the Residential Heritage Areas but seeks that additional areas of Hornby, South Hornby, Sockburn, Hei Hei, Islington, and Broomfield be considered	Reject, As no areas have been identified in these suburbs which would meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2063.191	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose	Accept
			FS2064.184	Retirement Village Association of New Zealand Incorporated.	Oppose	Accept

		S1090.6	Amend	Seeks a much larger Riccarton Heritage setting from Mona Vale to the Britten stables and war memorial at Jane Deans Close.	Reject, As it is not best practice to connect disparate heritage items which are already mapped and scheduled by applying a 'heritage setting' overlay to a suburb.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
			FS2037.651	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support
					Reject
Rosie Linterman	S1091	S1091.1, S1091.2	Amend	Seek that Beverley Street be included as a Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.
ISSUE 8 - OPPOSITION TO THE CONCEPT OF RHAS, OR TO THE NUMBER OF RHAS					
Logan Brunner	S191	S191.1	Oppose	That proposed Residential Heritage Areas are removed	Reject, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
			FS 2037.264	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose
					Accept
		S191.2	Oppose	That proposed Residential Heritage Areas are removed	Reject,

					As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
			FS2037.265	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose
			FS2051.113	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose
Christs College	S699, S1060	S699.1, S699.8, S699.10; S1060.1, S1060.8, - S1060.10 [RHA provisions]	Oppose	<p>Delete Residential Heritage Area from the following properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armagh Street – Numbers 6, 14, 16, 20 and 22 • Gloucester Street – Numbers 4, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 19 • Rolleston Avenue – Numbers 54, 64 and 72 (excluding the Heritage Items and Setting 267 at 64 Rolleston Ave). <p>The school holds a certificate of compliance for demolition of all of its buildings east of Rolleston Avenue.</p>	Reject, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs in their simplified form, are reasonable and justifiable.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose

			FS2037.544	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support in part (S699.1)	Accept in part
			FS2084.9.	Christian Jordan	Oppose (S699.1)	Accept
			FS2051.61	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S699.4)	Reject
			FS2093.1, FS2093.2, FS2093.3, FS2093.4	Christian Jordan	Oppose (S699.8 – S699.10)	Accept
Matthew Gibbons	S743	S743.4	Oppose	No new heritage areas should be allowed as they restrict development in parts of Christchurch where people want to live. A good rule would be that for every house added to a heritage area another is removed.	Reject, As the proposed rule is impractical. Properties in RHAs are included and their values assessed on a site specific basis.	
Carter Group Ltd	S824, S1080	S824.109, S824.110, S824.111, S824.113, S824.114, S824.115, S824.118, S824.120, S824.121, S824.125;	Oppose	Oppose all policies, rules, schedules and maps relating to RHAs, and seek their deletion. This includes opposing Policy 9.3.2.2.2 on identification, assessment and scheduling of heritage areas, Policy 9.3.2.2.5 on ongoing use, Policy 9.3.2.2.8 on demolition, Rules RD6 and RD7 for RHAs, and matters of discretion for RHAs in 9.3.6.4 and 9.3.6.5.	Reject overall, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable. However partly accept S824.109 in regard to a new second part of Policy 9.3.2.2.8 on demolition in Residential Heritage Areas, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition.	

		S1080: point nos. the same as for S824.	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.6	Susan Wall	Support (S824.125)	Reject
			FS2051	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2065	Davie Lovell- Smith Limited for Hughes Developments Ltd	Support	Reject
			FS2082	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Reject
			FS101.6, FS 101.7, FS101.8, FS101.9, FS101.10, FS101.11, FS101.12, FS101.13, FS101.14	Johanna King for CRFU	Support S1080.110, S1080.111, S1080.113, S1080.114, S1080.115, S1080.118, S1080.120, S1080.121, S1080.125	Reject
Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	S823	S823.83 (part), S823.131 – S823.135, S823.216 - S823.219, S823.221, S823.222, S823.225- S823.227, S823.231- S823.233	Oppose	Oppose all policies, rules, schedules and maps relating to RHAs, and seek their deletion.	Reject, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs in their simplified form, are reasonable and justifiable.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS 2037	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept
			FS2045	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Reject
Kāinga Ora	S834, S1093	S834.333 (part); s1093.333	Oppose	Opposes the proposed Residential Heritage Areas ('RHAs') in their entirety		Reject, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs in their simplified form are reasonable and justifiable. However partly accept, in regard to a new second part of Policy 9.3.2.2.8 on demolition in Residential Heritage Areas, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition. (see Issue 10). Also partly accept, in regard to extending the exceptions to Rule 9.3.4.1.3 RD6 to include all alterations to exteriors of neutral or intrusive buildings.(see Issue 10).

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2044.131	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject
			FS2045.137	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.114	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS97.1	Lisa Steele for Frank Greenslade	Support	Reject
			FS98.1	Johanna King for CRFU	Support	Reject
			FS100.1	Daniel and Rebecca Ellis	Support	Reject
		S834.334, S1093.334	Oppose	Oppose Residential Heritage Area provisions contained in section 9.3.6.4 (Matters of discretion for new buildings etc)		Reject, As this is essentially a consequential submission point from S834.333 above.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2044.132	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject

			FS2045.138	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.90	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			F97.2	Lisa Steele for Frank Greenslade	Support	Reject
			F98.2	Johanna King for CRFU	Support	Reject
		S834.335, S1093.335	Oppose	Oppose Residential Heritage Areas as listed in Appendix 9.3.7.3		Reject, As this is essentially a consequential submission point from S834.333 above.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2044.133	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject
			FS2045.139	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS97.3	Lisa Steele for Frank Greenslade	Support	Reject
			FS98.3	Johanna King for CRFU	Support	Reject
Kāinga Ora	S834, S1093	S834.337, S1093.337	Oppose	Oppose the assessments supporting the identification of RHAs as they predominantly focus on physical built form, and do not have sufficient		Reject, as this is not correct. See Issue 8 (C) discussion.

				consideration of historical values associated with the place.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
			FS2044.135	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support Reject
			FS2045.141	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support Reject
			FS97.4	Lisa Steele for Frank Greenslade	Support Reject
			FS98.4	Johanna King for CRFU	Support Reject
Richard Abbey-Nesbit	S1009	S1009.1- S1009.3	Oppose	The submitter supports limitation of heritage areas to those that genuinely possess a consistent style of built environment that is unique to the area.	Reject, As complete consistency is not required, and heritage areas are not only based on the built environment.
Kristin Mokes	S1025	S1025.1, S1025.2	Oppose	Reconsider adding so many more heritage sites - especially [in the] suburbs	Reject, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history.
Paul Mollard	S1030	S1030.1, S1030.2	Oppose	Remove any reference to residential heritage areas and make those areas subject to the same development rules as the rest of the city.	Reject, As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history.

Sam Spekreijse	S1033	S1033.1- S1033.3	Oppose	Oppose all heritage overlays for residential heritage areas.	Reject, As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.115	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose S1033.1	Accept
Peter Earl	S1038	S1038.1 (part)	Oppose	Oppose all heritage areas	Reject, As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.116	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
Cameron Matthews	S1048	S1048.1- S1048.16, S1048.19- S1048.36 (part)	Oppose	Strike out all rules or parts of rules as they relate to Residential Heritage Areas, particularly Lyttelton, and Inner City West RHAs.	Reject, As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential History. Lyttelton has heritage values which are significant at the regional and national level.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose - 23 submission points	Accept
			FS2015.1, FS2015.10	Susan Wall	Support (S1048.3, S1048.22)	Reject
Keri Whaitiri	S1069	S1069.1, S1069.2	Amend	Seek that the 'defining' and 'contributory' categories in Residential Heritage Areas are removed completely from the proposed new Policy Changes.		Reject, As removal of these categories would disable the RHA system.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
		FS2015.2	Susan Wall	Support (S1069.1)	Reject	
		FS2051.54	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1069.2)	Accept	
		S1069.3	Amend	Seeks that the full implications of the new 'Residential Heritage Areas' are disclosed and that these do not exceed the current provisions of the 'Residential Character Areas'.		Reject, As the implications of RHAs have been disclosed. RHA provisions are similar to, but simpler than those that were proposed for Residential Character Areas in PC14.
	S1070	S1070.2	Oppose	Delete/reject proposed amendments to definitions, policies, rules and		Reject,

Danny Whiting [with regard to RHAs]				assessment matters in PC13 and retain the status quo in respect of these provisions.	As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history, and the proposed provisions for RHAs in their simplified form, are reasonable and justifiable.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.9	Susan Wall	Support	Reject
			FS2051.47	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
Peebles Group Limited, Richard and Suzanne Peebles and 181 High Limited	S1071-S1073	S1071.1, S1072.3, 1073.2	Oppose	Delete/reject proposed amendments to definitions, policies, rules and assessment matters as they relate to heritage and retain the status quo in respect of these provisions.	Reject, As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history, and the proposed provisions for RHAs in their simplified form, are reasonable and justifiable.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.12	Susan Wall	Support (S1071.1)	Reject
			FS2051.39	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1071.1)	Accept

			FS2051.48, FS2051.49	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1072.3, S1973.2)	Accept
Duncans Lane Limited	S1085	S1085.3	Oppose	Delete/reject proposed amendments to definitions, policies, rules and assessment matters as they relate to heritage and retain the status quo in respect of these provisions.		Reject, As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history, and the proposed provisions for RHAs in their simplified form, are reasonable and justifiable.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.5	Susan Wall	Support	Reject
			FS2051.50	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
ISSUE 9 – SUPPORT RHAS/ SEEK MORE RHAS						
Susanne Trim	S37	S37.5, S37.6, S37.7 – part supporting RHAs only	Support	Retain the proposed Residential Heritage Areas		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	

			FS2092.2	Simon Watts for Brighton Observatory of Environment and Economics	Seek Amendment – oppose RHAs?	Reject
Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health	S145	S145.18	Support	Te Mana Ora supports the protection of Residential Heritage Areas and recognises the need to balance housing development with protecting areas of cultural heritage and identity.		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.209	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	S193, S1046	S193.2, S193.3, S193.6, S193.7, S193.10, S193.15, S193.16, S193.18, S193.24; S1046 – point nos. the same as for S193	Support	Retain definitions of defining, contributory, neutral and intrusive buildings as proposed. [also see Issue 3 on these definitions]. Retain RHA policies, rules and matters of discretion as proposed.		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.272, FS2037.274	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept

Michael Dore	S225	S225.5	Support	The history, character and heritage of our city of Christchurch should be protected at all costs	Accept in part, but reject in part in regard to the words “at all costs”. [See also Mrs Richmond’s evidence on this point]	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.316	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept
			FS2051.118	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept
Lawrence Kiesanowsk	S404	S404.1	Support	Support plan change provisions to protect historic heritage areas.	Accept	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.40	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept
Sarah Wylie	S428	S428.3	Support	Support the protection of heritage areas	Accept	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.41	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept

Hilary Talbot	S700	S700.1- S700.3, S700.6	Support	[Re: Englefield Heritage Area] support the creation of the Heritage Area [and the continuation of the character area] with more stringent controls	Accept	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support (all four points)	Accept
			FS2051.42	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S700.1)	Accept
		S700.4, S700.5	Support	Support the retention of heritage listed Englefield House [in the context of the RHA]. [This topic is also covered in the evidence of Mrs Richmond]	Accept	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
FS2037.549, FS2037.550, FS2037.990, FS2037.991	Christchurch Civic Trust		Support	Accept		
Margaret Stewart	S755, S1095	S755.4, S1095.4	Support	Retain Heritage areas	Accept	
Historic Places Canterbury	S835	S835.20 (part)	Support	The submitter welcomes the addition of [11] Residential Heritage areas	Accept	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.607 and FS2037.705	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept
			FS2051.120	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept
Peter Dyhrberg	S885	S885.3, S885.4, S885.6, S885.7	Support	Retain the proposed Residential Heritage Areas and rules relating to them		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.119	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S885.3)	Accept
			FS2062.23	Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association	Support (S885.6)	Accept
Julie Florkowski	S1019	S1019.1, S1019.2	Support	Supports the Residential Heritage Areas of Otautahi, Christchurch (specifically, Alpha Avenue).		Accept in part, as Alpha Avenue is not proposed as part of an RHA, but rather as part of the Papanui War Memorial Avenues heritage item.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	

			FS2051.121	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S1019.2)	Accept
Chris Florkowski	S1020	S1020.2, S1020.3	Support	Support Residential Heritage Areas of Otautahi, Christchurch, which deserve special protection		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.45, FS2051.122	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept
Maxine Webb	S1026	S1026.1 (part)	Support	The submitter supports the heritage areas and is of the view that they should have a wider extent to protect the character of Christchurch.		Accept, noting that heritage areas need to be identified and assessed in a robust manner, and be supported by provisions which are reasonable and justifiable.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.123	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept
Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-	S1077	S1077.1	Support	Supports the addition of the MacMillan Avenue and Shelley/Forbes Street Residential Heritage Areas.		Accept

Heathcote Community Board			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.664	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept
Christian Jordan	S1086 and S737 [statements on RHAs not coded in S737]	S1086.5, S1086.6 and S1086.7	Amend	Further heritage areas need to be assessed and created across the city to protect Christchurch's remaining built history.		Accept , noting that heritage areas need to be identified and assessed in a robust manner, and be supported by provisions which are reasonable and justifiable.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2099.9, FS2099.10. FS2099.11	Kāinga Ora	Oppose (S1086.7)	Reject
			FS2095.5	Chapman Tripp for Ryman Healthcare Ltd	Oppose (S1086.7)	Reject
			FS2096.5	Chapman Tripp for Retirement Village Assn of NZ Incorporated	Oppose (S1086.7)	Reject
Christchurch Civic Trust	S1089	S1089.2	Support	Support the Scheduled Highly Significant Englefield Lodge [in the context of the RHA]. [This topic is also mentioned in the evidence of Mrs Richmond]		Accept

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.653	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept
ISSUE 10 - AMEND RHA RULES SO THEY ARE LESS RESTRICTIVE						
Christ's College	S699, S1060	S699.5, S1060.4, S1060.5	Amend	Reject all notified changes to Policy 9.3.2.2.8– Demolition of scheduled historic heritage. It is inappropriate that buildings located within a heritage area are subject to the same policy test as listed heritage items.		Partly accept in regard to a new second part of demolition Policy 9.3.2.2.8, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition.
Hilary Talbot	S700	S700.7	Amend	The drafting of these rules should be reviewed to see if a more nuanced approach to buildings in heritage areas is appropriate.		Partly accept, As this report recommends an exception to the RHA rules for sustainability and energy conservation measures.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.552, FS2037.993	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Partly accept.

Melissa Macfarlane	S1003	S1003.1.	Amend	Delete Rule 9.3.4.1.3 RD6 entirely or if Residential Heritage Areas remain included in the proposed plan, include a more appropriate and targeted rule, e.g. only apply it to new buildings greater than 30m ² or the alteration of defining or contributory external building fabric by more than 35%.	Reject, As larger scale accessory buildings can still make a significant contribution to the values of RHAs. How much of the external building fabric is being altered will not necessarily correspond to effect on heritage values.		
		S1003.4	Amend	Amend the definition of 'Heritage fabric' to exclude 'heritage area' or exclude heritage area buildings that are not defining or contributory.	Reject, As removal of neutral and intrusive sites from RHAs or effectively from the need for an RD consent for rebuilding would negate the possibility of heritage enhancement of an area for at least this chunk of buildings, and could even result in buildings which detract from the heritage values of the area.		
					Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
				FS2051.16	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
		S1003.6	Amend	Delete 9.3.6.4 or amend 9.3.6.4 to remove matters that focus on the dwelling itself (which is not individually listed) and target the assessment to impacts on the wider residential heritage area.	Partly accept, As the report recommends some amendments to the matters of discretion for new buildings and alterations within RHAs, for example to make it clearer that there is intended to be a primary focus on the collective		

					values of the heritage area, with only a secondary focus on individual buildings.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
			FS2051.79	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose Partly accept
		S1003.11- S1003.13	Amend	Delete references to RHAs in Policies 9.3.2.2.3, 9.3.2.2.5 and 9.3.2.2.8. Instead include a new fit for purpose targeted policy for residential heritage areas that focuses on impacts on the recognised values of the area, i.e. interwar Californian bungalows	Partly accept, As the report recommends some amendments to the matters of discretion for new buildings and alterations within RHAs, for example to make it clearer that there is intended to be a primary focus on the collective values of the heritage area, with only a secondary focus on individual buildings.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose
			FS2051.60	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1003.12). Partly accept
			FS2051.67	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1003.13) Partly accept

Jayne Smith	S1017	S1017.2, S1017.4	Amend	Supports Residential Heritage Areas but has some concerns regarding the ability to make alterations to the exterior of their property for sustainability and other reasons.	Partly accept, As this report recommends an exception to the RHA rules for sustainability and energy conservation measures.	
Emily Arthur	S1036	S1036.1	Amend	Amend RD7 so that consent is not required to demolish a contributory building in a Residential Heritage Area.	Reject, As it is not appropriate to remove the need for demolition consents for the more significant buildings, as that would provide free rein for people to remove the buildings which contribute most to the heritage values of the area. However, the report recommends adding a non-notification rule for demolition of contributory buildings.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.80	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
Cameron Matthews	S1048	S1048.17, S1048.18	Oppose	Strike out all rules or parts of rules as they relate to RHA's and Heritage Areas,[see Issue 10] including definitions of Contributory and Defining Buildings	Reject, As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. Removal of these categories would disable the RHA system.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.8, FS2051.11	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
Keri Whaitiri	S1069	S1069.1, S1069.2	Oppose	Seek that the 'defining' and 'contributory' categories in Residential Heritage Areas are removed completely from the proposed new Policy Changes.		Reject, As removal of these categories would disable the RHA system.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.2	Susan Wall	Support (S1069.1)	Reject
			FS2051.54	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1069.2)	Accept
Julie Villard	S1078	S1078 [points not coded]	Amend	[Points not coded]. Limit RHA in Lyttelton to defining and contributory sites. Neutral sites do not have any architectural significance or historical values	Reject, As removal of neutral sites from RHAs or effectively from the need for an RD consent for rebuilding, would negate the possibility of heritage enhancement of an area for at least this chunk of buildings, and could even result in buildings which detract from the heritage values of the area.	
ISSUE 11 – CLARIFY HOW RHA RULES WILL WORK/MAKE MINOR AMENDMENTS SO THEY WORK BETTER						

Fire and Emergency NZ	S842	S842.73	Oppose	Regarding Rule 9.3.4.1.1 P2, Fire and Emergency seek clarity as to whether an intrusive building within a residential heritage area would be subject to the activity specific standards set out in permitted activity rule 9.3.4.1.1.- repairs to a building in a heritage area.	Accept. See wording amendment to P2.	
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2084.2	Christian Jordan	Oppose	Reject
Fire and Emergency NZ	S842	S842.74	Oppose	Assume 91 Chester St East is not subject to 9.3.4.1.1 P3 (a)(iv) temporary activities in a heritage area – clarify.	Partly accept, as although temporary buildings are likely to be visible beyond the site, the reduction of area of the site covered by the RHA to the first 5m from the road boundary, means that the relief sought is almost irrelevant.	
Melissa Macfarlane	S1003	S1003.5	Amend	Exclude heritage areas from the definition of heritage fabric or amend RD1 so it does not apply to activities covered by Rule 9.3.4.1.3 RD6.	Accept. See wording addition to RD1	
Waipapa Papanui-Innes- Central Community Board	S1016	S1016.3	Amend	Continue to consider any additional suggestions of historical significance that are received through this process. Provision should be made for interim protection of areas (and sites) with potential heritage values to allow time	Reject, As there is no need to insert a provision to this effect as this could be done at any time by plan change. It is not possible under the RMA to provide interim protection for potential RHAs	

				for necessary in-depth investigation to be undertaken.	
Rob Seddon-Smith	S1028	S1028.2	Amend	Seeks a clear definition of what constitutes the particular 'heritage' character of each area, so that it is easy to determine how any proposed development might meet such character standards.	Reject, As it would be too difficult to draft standards which captured the variable and often contextual heritage features of all the different RHAs. These include streetscapes and public realm features.
		S1028.4	Amend	Seeks that a date not more than 30 years hence whereby the heritage status of an area and the rules governing it should be reviewed or otherwise automatically removed.	Reject, As RHAs would be reviewed in the normal course of every District Plan review (nominally every 10 years), or could be reviewed more often by plan change.
Oxford Baptist Church	S1052	S1052.5	Amend	Seeks that any development of 94-96 Chester Street East be publicly notified.	Reject, As public notification of consents for vacant sites cannot be assured, because decisions on public notification have to be based on a judgement at the time of application, on whether an activity will have or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor.

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2084.4	Christian Jordan	Support	Reject
Hughes Developments Limited	S1062	S1062.1	Amend	Seek that the activity status for development in Residential Heritage Areas is made clearer.		Reject, Because contributions ratings could only be changed via a plan change or at a District Plan review, whereas the heritage reports behind them are non-statutory and could be updated at any time.
		S1062.2	Amend	Amend Residential Heritage Area - Heritage Report and Site Record Forms - HA6 Inner City West to remove references to 31 Worcester containing buildings on site.		Accept
ISSUE 12- QUESTION/OPPOSE ZONING IN AND AROUND RHAS						
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board	S1016	S1016.2	Oppose	Address the impact of the HRZ area between Chester St East and Englefield RHAs. [Rezone high density zone between Chester Street East and Fitzgerald Ave to Residential Heritage Area]		Reject, As the eastern end of the street would not qualify as an RHA . In addition the rejection of RHAs and MRZ zoning for RHAs in PC14, means that the height limits in the proposed RHA are now higher than in the part of Chester St to the east of the RHA.
ISSUE 13 – OTHER MISCELLANEOUS RHA SUBMISSIONS						

Jayne Smith	S1017	S1017.3	Support	Support [Policy 9.3.2.2.10 on] incentives and assistance for historic heritage	Partly accept, As although this is a Council policy, the Council budget for heritage protection is limited at this time.
R.Seddon-Smith	S1028	S1028.3	Amend	Seeks an effective means of compensating owners of property deemed to be of heritage value for the additional expenses incurred in maintenance and any loss of value as a result of the designation.	Reject As there is no possibility that Council could compensate owners to the extent sought in this submission.