

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Jack **Last name:** Hobern

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 70 Straven Road

Suburb: Fendalton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8014

Email: jackhobern01@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 01.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 01.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 01.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 01.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Devanh **Last name:** Patel

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: Unit 402, The Forge, 36C

Welles Street

Suburb: Christchurch Central

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8011

Email: devanshpatelddo@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 02.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 02.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 02.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 02.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support it, but it could be better. I suggest council to push 35 stories instead of 10 in city centre as it will intensify Christchurch further and could say millions of dollars every year. Also, it would make the city more carbon efficient and help Christchurch achieve any new carbon goals which will be coming in the future.

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Evan **Last name:** Ross

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 9A Suva Street

Suburb: Upper Riccarton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8041

Email: evanlloydross@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 03.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 03.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 03.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 03.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Daniel **Last name:** Morris

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 1 Dorset Street

Suburb: Christchurch Central

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Email: dmorris42@hotmail.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 04.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 04.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 04.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 04.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Benjamin **Last name:** Wilton

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 48 Wales Street

Suburb: Halswell

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8025

Email: benjaminwilton96@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 05.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 05.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support intensification as described but only within a 1.2km radius of the Christchurch CBD.

Definitely NOT all centers.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Alanna **Last name:** Reid

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 27 Veitches Road

Suburb: Casebrook

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8051

Email: alanna.reid.26@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 06.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:**Original Point:****Points:** 06.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council*If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area***My submission is that**

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:**Original Point:****Points:** 06.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council*If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area***My submission is that**

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:**Original Point:****Points:** 06.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council*If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area***My submission is that**

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Mathew **Last name:** Cairns

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 68 Woodhurst Drive

Suburb: Casebrook

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8051

Email: matt17cairns@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 07.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 07.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 07.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 07.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Denisa **Last name:** Dumitrescu

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: Baynes Street, Burwood,

Christchurch

Suburb: Burwood

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode:

Email: denisaamada@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 08.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 08.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 08.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 08.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and

amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Morgan **Last name:** Patterson

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 29 Dudley Street

Suburb: Richmond

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Email: morgansaccount@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 09.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 09.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 09.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Alexia **Last name:** Katsipis

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 478B Hereford Street

Suburb: Linwood

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8011

Email: a.katsipis@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 10.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 10.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 10.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 10.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Ailbhe **Last name:** Redmile

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 26 Bayview Place

Suburb: Cass Bay

City: Lyttelton

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8082

Email: ailbheredmile@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 11.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 11.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 11.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Hamish **Last name:** McLeod

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 5 Player Place

Suburb: Shirley

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8061

Email: hamish.leif@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 12.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 12.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 12.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 12.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Noah **Last name:** Simmonds

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 11 Halswell Junction Road

Suburb: Halswell

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8025

Email: n.simmonds545@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 13.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 13.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 13.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 13.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Matthew **Last name:** Coulthurst

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 6 Quirk Place

Suburb: Sockburn

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8042

Email: mv.coulthurst@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 14.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 14.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 14.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 14.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Matthew **Last name:** Coulthurst

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 6 Quirk Place

Suburb: Sockburn

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8042

Email: mv.coulthurst@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Attached Documents

File

MatthewCoulthurst

Martin, Aimee

From: INPC Business Support
Sent: Monday, 15 May 2023 1:31 pm
To: Martin, Aimee
Subject: FW: CCC District Plan Changes (PC14) - Generation Zero Quick Submit / 531

From: Generation Zero <noreply@123formbuilder.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 May 2023 4:10 pm
To: Engagement <engagement@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: CCC District Plan Changes (PC14) - Generation Zero Quick Submit / 531

This is a submission on the proposed Christchurch District Plan changes via the Generation Zero quick submission form. The feedback below is on PC14.

Form Summary

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. First / Last name | Matthew Coulthurst |
| 2. Email address | mv.coulthurst@xtra.co.nz |
| 3. Postal Address | 6 Quirk Place
Sockburn Christchurch
8042 |
| 4. Trade competition/adverse effects: | Option 1: I could not gain in trade competition through this submission |
| 5. Answer if you selected option 2 above: | Are you directly affected by a possible effect of this plan change in a way that it:
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions |

Form Summary

Chapter 6 - Tree Canopy Cover and Financial Contributions

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Chapter 14 - Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Chapter 14 - Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Chapter 14 - High-Density Residential Zone

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for

Form Summary

residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Any other comments?

The message has been sent from 122.62.55.131 nz at 2023-05-10 on Chrome 113.0.0.0

Entry ID: 189

Referrer: <https://www.generationzero.org/>

Form Host: <https://form.123formbuilder.com/6423130/ccc-district-plan-changes-pc14-generation-zero>

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Analijja **Last name:** Thomas

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 80 Sir John McKenzie

Avenue

Suburb: Yaldhurst

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8042

Email: analijjat@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 15.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 15.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 15.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 15.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and

amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File

No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Elizabeth **Last name:** Oquist

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 74D Vanguard Drive

Suburb: Broomfield

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8042

Email: lishieburr@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 16.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 16.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 16.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 16.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Tegan **Last name:** Mays

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 37 Glenrowan Avenue

Suburb: Avondale

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8061

Email: teganmays@hotmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 17.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 17.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 17.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 17.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Lance **Last name:** Woods

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 465 Barbadoes Street

Suburb: Edgware

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Email: Lance.woods@outlook.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 18.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 18.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 18.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 18.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Lance **Last name:** Woods

Preferred method of contact

Postal address: 465 Barbadoes Street

Suburb:

City:

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Attached Documents

File
Lance Woods

Robson, Gina

From: Generation Zero <noreply@123formbuilder.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 May 2023 9:50 pm
To: Engagement
Subject: CCC District Plan Changes (PC14) - Generation Zero Quick Submit / 531

This is a submission on the proposed Christchurch District Plan changes via the Generation Zero quick submission form. The feedback below is on PC14.

Form Summary

1. First / Last name	Lance Woods
2. Email address	Lance.woods@outlook.co.nz
3. Postal Address	465 Barbadoes Street Edgeware Christchurch 8013
4. Trade competition/adverse effects:	Option 1: I could not gain in trade competition through this submission
5. Answer if you selected option 2 above:	Are you directly affected by a possible effect of this plan change in a way that it: a. adversely affects the environment, and b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions Option 2: No
Chapter 6 - Tree Canopy Cover and Financial Contributions	The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of

Form Summary

environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Chapter 14 - Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Chapter 14 - Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Chapter 14 - High-Density Residential Zone

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Form Summary

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Any other comments?

The message has been sent from 125.238.243.7 nz at 2023-05-09 on Chrome 112.0.0.0

Entry ID: 185

Referrer: <https://www.generationzero.org/>

Form Host: <https://form.123formbuilder.com/6423130/ccc-district-plan-changes-pc14-generation-zero>

Robson, Gina

From: Generation Zero <noreply@123formbuilder.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 May 2023 9:50 pm
To: Engagement
Subject: CCC District Plan Changes (PC14) - Generation Zero Quick Submit / 531

This is a submission on the proposed Christchurch District Plan changes via the Generation Zero quick submission form. The feedback below is on PC14.

Form Summary

1. First / Last name	Lance Woods
2. Email address	Lance.woods@outlook.co.nz
3. Postal Address	465 Barbadoes Street Edgeware Christchurch 8013
4. Trade competition/adverse effects:	Option 1: I could not gain in trade competition through this submission
5. Answer if you selected option 2 above:	Are you directly affected by a possible effect of this plan change in a way that it: a. adversely affects the environment, and b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions Option 2: No
Chapter 6 - Tree Canopy Cover and Financial Contributions	The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of

Form Summary

environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Chapter 14 - Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Chapter 14 - Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Chapter 14 - High-Density Residential Zone

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Form Summary

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Any other comments?

The message has been sent from 125.238.243.7 nz at 2023-05-09 on Chrome 112.0.0.0

Entry ID: 185

Referrer: <https://www.generationzero.org/>

Form Host: <https://form.123formbuilder.com/6423130/ccc-district-plan-changes-pc14-generation-zero>

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Oscar **Last name:** Templeton

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 137 Somerfield Street

Suburb: Somerfield

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8024

Email: thehunt3r@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 19.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 19.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 19.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 19.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Izak **Last name:** Dobbs

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 41 Stillwater Avenue

Suburb: Burwood

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8083

Email: zaria.dobbs@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 20.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 20.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 20.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 20.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Loren **Last name:** Kennedy

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 97 Dover Street

Suburb: St Albans

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8014

Email: loren.kennedy@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 21.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 21.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Ella **Last name:** Herriot

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 38 St Johns Street

Suburb: Woolston

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8062

Email: el.herriot@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 22.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 22.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 22.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Peter **Last name:** Dobbs

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 1 Carrington Street

Suburb: St Albans

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8014

Email: peteinsta@yahoo.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 23.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 23.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 23.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 23.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Peter **Last name:** Dobbs

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 1 Carrington Street

Suburb: St Albans

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8014

Email: peteinsta@yahoo.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 23.5

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 23.6

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 23.7

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 23.8

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Daniel **Last name:** Scott

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 100 Suva Street

Suburb: Upper Riccarton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8041

Email: itsdanscott@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Daniel **Last name:** Scott

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 100 Suva Street

Suburb: Upper Riccarton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8041

Email: itsdanscott@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.5

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.6

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.7

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 24.8

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Pamela-Jayne **Last name:** Cooper

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 404 Montreal Street

Suburb: Christchurch Central

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Email: pjstylianou@msn.com

Daytime Phone: 0211412400

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Additional requirements for hearing:

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

6.10A.2.1.1 Policy – Contribution to tree canopy cover

- i. Maintain existing tree status quo if 20% or over. New build to ensure tree canopy achieves 25% (New and existing).
- ii. No removal of existing mature trees. New developments to make provisions for 30%

6.10A.4.2.1 Tree canopy cover standards and calculations

6.10A.4.2.1

b. 'The **tree canopy cover area** may be located on any part of the **development site** and does not need to be associated with each **residential unit**.' More provision to locate tree canopy to individual residences wherever feasible.

As my submission is time critical and does not permit me to indulge in particulars, I have listed a couple of amendments only. I have concerns on multiple levels, more particular, grave concerns as to the formulation of rules and the overall city plan. I do not think it stringent enough.

While I very much support financial enforcement on developers, it does not go far enough. Any progressive developer will not be put off by additional tree expenses. Indeed they will welcome them, as they will only serve to enhance their investment by providing safe, healthy and resilient havens for buyers and residents. Developers whom oppose tree retention/and or new plantings citing them as being unviable financial hurdles should be scrutinised the more. In this global climate, all developments should align themselves to resilience, adoptability and public wellness. Not matter the initial costs. This cost will prove to be the lesser over time. And there are masses of respected climate models out there, that foretell the economical disaster, if we fail to do enough.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

- i. that is safe and efficient for all transport modes;

NB: Are humans considered forms of transport?

- i. that is safe and efficient for all transport modes;
- ii. that is responsive to the current recovery needs, future needs, and enables economic development, in particular an able to accommodate projected population growth;

Vague. I wish clarification on all the above.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

- Subchapter 14.14 Rules

Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanisms

This has all been strikes out??? It is nonsense.

The DISTRICT PLAN TEXT AMENDMENTS are painful to read. I am not confident that I have completely understood or interpreted parts.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.5

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

7.2.1.2

- i. do not compromise the safe, efficient and effective use of the [transport system](#);
- i. provide patterns of development that optimise use of the existing [transport system](#);

Present transport system in Christchurch is car centric. It does not allow for safe, efficient and effective use for those, myself included, that purposely relocated into the city to live without a car. I want to see more clean, frequent buses, trains, shuttles, trams become our transport system. That's worth supporting.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.6

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

Seek clarification.

Due to the format and consequent readability of the document. I am unable to support or oppose at this point.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 25.7

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

3.1 Introduction

- A. the requirements for notification and written approval
 - i. Set objectives and policies that clearly state the outcomes that are intended for the **Christchurch district**;
 - i. Provide for the effective functioning of the urban environment of the **Christchurch district**, reflecting the changes resulting from the Canterbury earthquakes, including changes to population, land suitability, infrastructure, and transport; NB: Providing transport is people and clean public vehicle centric.
- A. having regard to constraints on environmental and infrastructure capacity, particularly
 - with regard to natural hazards; and
- A. providing for a wide range of housing types and locations;
- v. Set a clear direction on the use and development of land for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating natural hazards; and
- vi. Use clear, concise language so that the Plan is easy to understand and use
- c. The **Council** must commence a review of the provisions of an operative **district plan** within 10 years of the provisions having last been reviewed or changed, meaning that this Plan is likely to have a life of not less than 10 years. Whilst certain parts of the district's built

environment will have been reestablished and aspects of peoples' lives will have returned to normal within that timeframe, the district as a whole will still be in a state of recovery. In this Plan, therefore, the term "recovery" is intended to span the entire ten year timeframe, and in so doing facilitate the return to normality as quickly as possible, while also creating a strong platform for the longer term future of the district.

Attached Documents

File
Submission_additional file

Chapter 3 Strategic Directions

3.1 (V): I support the goal to provide additional housing options and urban intensification generally. With sunlight and height restrictions to 3 stories (with consent) within High Density zones. There is a great need to provide affordable, well designed social ho21) using, along with accessible community support systems, within both the city centre and surrounding suburbs.

I am concerned with our Council's intentions in response to NPS-UD.

"Over the next 30 years it's predicted we'll need more than 40,000 new houses in Otautahi Christchurch to ensure everyone has a place to live. This means re-thinking some of our planning rules to allow more housing choice and provide greater opportunities for business development" (p.5, consultation Document)

The CCC's own figures (see Table 4; Greater chch Housing Development Capacity Assessment 30/07/21) projection is not a deficit of 40,000 new houses but a surplus of 60,700 over the same time frame.

Planning Maps

I **request** a max consented height of 60m (with consent) in the City Centre cascading as proposed. Greater consideration for the prevention of 'ugly' and inferior builds, which maximize profit, before city and citizens wellbeing and movement.

Chapter 14 Residential

I **support** Objective 14.2.1 (a) (i) about providing a range of housing types and sizes. However, I **oppose** Standard 14.6.2.1 (b) that will make it difficult for anyone to build a one-storey dwelling, even on a small section in the HDRZ.

I also **oppose** Standard 14.6.2.2 (b) because of no recession plane requirement for buildings over 12m. The setback alone is unlikely to provide sufficient access to sunlight for neighbouring properties.

Chapter 6 (in particular 6.10A) Tree Canopy

I **support** any move to make it more likely that the tree canopy cover will be increased (not just maintained). This is the intention of many of the objectives and policies, which I **support**. However, the Standards do not go far enough to make this a reality.

I **support** the concept of a financial contribution (present figure increased), but only in cases where retaining or replanting trees on the site cannot be accomplished. I **request** that the Standards and Matters of Discretion are rewritten to make this clear. I also **request** that the financial contribution is increased to ensure it is a disincentive to remove mature trees that could be incorporated into the building design.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: carol **Last name:** shu

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 177 Withells Road

Suburb: Avonhead

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8042

Email: carolshy2003@yahoo.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 021709328

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 26.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

keep hyde park and avonhead area all RS zoning.

My submission is that

please keep hyde park and avonhead area all RS zoning.

Attached Documents

File

No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Simon **Last name:** Bartholomew

Organisation: Plain and Simple Ltd

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 487 Marine Parade

Suburb: South New Brighton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8062

Email: simon@plainandsimple.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 021616866

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 27.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

We are seeking minor amendments to the stated objectives and the development of a comprehensive operative section that gives effect to:

- The recognition that social and cultural wellbeing is a critical consideration in planning for our housing in objective 3.3.1;

- The inclusion of choice and recognition of social and affordable housing as bottomlines in objective 3.3.4
- The recognition of diverse and changing needs of our community over time in objectives 3.3.1, 3.3.4, 3.3.7.

We are deeply concerned that these desirable objectives will not be met without a comprehensive operative section.

We also recommend minor amendments that explicitly include recognition of the role of housing in fostering social cohesion and a sense of community belonging. Social cohesion appears implied within the current framing of the objectives and it is appropriate to render it explicit;

We also recommend that there should be a principle within the Plan that provides for our developments to prioritise support for the most vulnerable members of our society. This includes amongst others, the street community, the elderly, the disabled, the infirm, and the young.

My submission is that

As per the attached submission, we broadly support the stated objectives but offer some minor amendments. We are deeply concerned that the stated objectives are not supported by adequate operative mechanisms and make extensive recommendations in the attached submission.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 27.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

We request that Council develop a comprehensive approach to operative provisions to achieve social, environmental and 'fit for the future' objectives of the Plan, as detailed in the attached submission. We specifically recommend that:

- **explicit guidance is provided to ensure that all new builds falling under PC 14 meet accessibility standards.**
- **explicit guidance is provided to ensure that the market delivers mainstream alternative housing options with accessible green space and appropriate amenity values.**
- **explicit guidance is provided to ensure the integration of social and affordable housing in mixed communities.**
- **prototyping zones are created within PC 14 with rules and aligned support that facilitates innovation and prototyping of new choices of housing.**
- **The regulatory settings are regeared to incentivise, rather than discourage conversion to environmentally responsible design features**
- that two approaches to operative mechanisms are considered: (a) an intentional planning approach and/or (b) explicit guidelines.

The planning approach could involve plans at a suburb level that:

- specify the mix of different types of housing, perhaps in the form of suburb specific caps for different bedroom numbers;
- create rules for mixed heights on sites of different sizes;
- targets for the volume of social and affordable housing;
- create rules for distance from/ accessibility to community infrastructure.

An explicit guidelines approach would address similar matters, as detailed in the attached submission.

We also consider it is critical that PC 14 elevate small clusters of mixed use areas. Whilst Christchurch needs to stop the lateral spread of the city, it also must be mindful to develop 'mini towns', or 'community hubs', where job opportunities, health services, recreational facilities and public transport are freely available

My submission is that

We support a number of the objectives guiding this section, subject to minor amendment. However, we are deeply concerned that the orientation of this section is wrongly geared and will undermine the Plan achieving the desired ends. We strongly recommend that additional operative provisions are developed to achieve the social, environmental and 'fit for the future' objectives of the Plan.

Attached Documents

File
FNL Plain and Simple PC 14

Submission on Proposed Housing and Business Choice Plan Change (PC14)

On behalf of:
Plain and Simple Ltd

Supported by:
Jenny Smith
Jono Kitt
Dana Van Den Broek
Fiona McPherson
Stefan Jeckel
Helen Kok

We respectfully request to be heard in support of this submission.

PLAIN 
SIMPLE

Executive Summary

This submission concentrates on the proposed changes concerning Medium Density Residential Zoning. We support Medium Density residential housing because we consider it is necessary to meet two overriding priorities: future demographic needs and social justice in achieving housing security across our community. We also support the proposed objectives, albeit with recommendations for changes in wording. However, we are deeply concerned that the proposed plan does not contain adequate provisions to meet its stated objectives, particularly in respect of housing affordability, diversity and meeting the needs of our future population. Our principal recommendations are that there needs to be further rules developed to ensure diverse and appropriate housing that meets the needs of current and future generations. In our view, there are two options for appropriate safeguards:

- Wider use of overlay type mechanisms, that delivers diverse and appropriate housing stock through intentional planning; and/or
- Explicit rules that govern diversity and responsiveness.

Submitters

This submission is made on behalf of Plain and Simple Ltd supported by a number of individuals involved in the housing sector.

Plain and Simple is an architectural design studio based in Christchurch. A team of two that originally hail from Europe. We seek to work exclusively with clients who share our core values and wish to build ecologically sound housing with responsible footprints. Psychology and the built environment is of particular interest to us. We also work alongside various community groups, trusts and charities on small scale, high impact projects.

The individuals in support of the submission hold leadership roles in social housing, community development and/or design. Jenny Smith is the Co-ordinator of Te Whare Roimata. She has been a change agent in community development and social justice for over 30 years and has deep insight into community aspirations and housing needs. Jono Kitt is a community development expert, having held a number of roles in Christchurch organisations that serve exposed communities.

Dana van den Broek is an LBP design 2 registered Architectural Designer who has recognized expertise in private residential works as well as teaching into design programmes at Ara. Fiona McPherson is also an LBP design 2 registered Architectural Designer with 30 years architectural experience and particular expertise in high performance non – toxic architecture. Helen Kok is a BIM designer and Stefan Jeckel is a recent architectural technician graduate.

Our shared interest in making this submission is to enable people, whānau and communities to flourish. For us, housing is a critical determinant of human wellbeing and the ability of people to create lives they aspire to. Much of our respective work in the community aims to address the consequences of housing insecurity and inaccessibility, and collectively, we have been envisioning practicable solutions that meet the lived realities of the whānau and communities we support.

Support for Objectives

We note that PC 14 contains a number of objectives and policies that we consider valuable, and specifically commend the following:

- The recognition that social and cultural wellbeing is a critical consideration in planning for our housing in objective 3.3.1;
- The inclusion of choice and recognition of social and affordable housing as bottomlines in objective 3.3.4;
- The recognition of diverse and changing needs of our community over time in objectives 3.3.1, 3.3.4, 3.3.7;
- The priority placed on enabling a wide range of housing under objective 14.2.1;
- The priority placed on improving housing affordability under objective 14.2.1.

We consider that these objectives are necessary to achieve human wellbeing and ensure the responsiveness and suitability of our housing stock to the lived realities of our community, in all its diversity and complexity. However, as below, we also recommend changes to the wording of some of these objectives.

Recommended Changes to Objectives

We recommend that the objectives within PC 14 are amended to explicitly include recognition of the role of housing in fostering social cohesion and a sense of community belonging. In our experience, one of the pernicious consequences of our current housing situation is the social isolation and, at times, alienation, people experiencing housing insecurity encounter.

Our developments should be designed in such a way to support the most vulnerable members of our society. This includes amongst others, the street community, the elderly, the disabled, the infirm, and the young. Offering the protection and assistance they need whilst maintaining their independence. This can be done by having support networks available throughout the community. The vulnerable need to be integrated into the local community rather than being isolated as the current model dictates. This isolation creates a two way barrier to successful integration. The isolated feel it is harder to reach out to other members of the community. It also creates a negative image of a group of people that need assistance rather than an individual person

In this way, the impacts of social isolation directly correlate to impaired wellbeing, economic exclusion and can contribute to connected and cumulative experiences of social disadvantage. In our view, social cohesion is both a desirable objective for our housing plan as well as a desirable social outcome, if the plan is well implemented. Social cohesion also appears implied within the current framing of the objectives and it is appropriate to render it explicit. As a city, we have a significant legacy of courageously pursuing social justice: we should uphold this legacy in PC 14.

An international example of directed social cohesion is Aedes in Holland. Aedes is the national organisation promoting the interests of practically every social housing association in the Netherlands, on all possible fronts. Together, Aedes members manage 2.3 million dwellings, constituting 32% of the total housing stock.

Aedes members are modern real estate organisations and service providers, working independently at their own expense and risk. They supply a broad package of affordable housing services that meet the various needs of their clients. Apart from housing, this includes a wide range of services that add to the liveability of neighbourhoods. Aedes works

together with its members on living/care arrangements for the elderly and groups with special needs, such as mentally or physically disabled and refugees. Aedes also supports housing associations in city development plans by entering into collaborative relationships with other organisations. (Leijen, n.d.)

Principal Concerns-- Omission of Operative Mechanisms for Stated Objectives

PC 14 has, in our view a striking absence of operative mechanisms to achieve the stated objectives and high level policies described above. While there are detailed rules for height, landscaping features, amenity values and the like, there appears to be a complete omission of rules or processes that are explicitly designed to ensure the diversity, responsiveness and affordability of housing. We recognise that it may be intended that the current rules indirectly achieve these objectives, however, we consider they are too attenuated from the stated objectives to be effective. Based on our current situation, we believe it is unambiguous that the market will not meet the stated objectives without mandatory direction to do so. Accordingly, we strongly recommend that additional operative rules or mechanisms are developed to achieve the stated objectives of diversity, responsiveness and affordability of housing.

We consider that there are two principal types of approaches that could be considered:

- Wider use of overlay type mechanisms, that delivers diverse and appropriate housing stock through intentional planning; and/or
- Explicit rules that govern diversity and responsiveness.

We describe each of these options below, after describing some of the current realities we consider most pertinent.

Current Realities

- Accessibility
- Socio-economic segregation
- Housing insecurity

Accessibility is a critical issue to meet the needs of our aging population. However, in New Zealand there is currently no provision for accessibility to be taken into account when designing private residential buildings (Standards, 2001). As a result, most of our housing stock is inaccessible for those reliant on wheelchairs and experiencing other disabilities. Adapting existing stock is often a long and expensive process, as building consent is required for many alterations that would be needed including level access showers and modifications to entrance ways (Equipment and modification, 2021). Internationally the provision for accessible housing has been recognised in some areas. Norway and Japan are considered successful in providing accessible housing residentially. This can be attributed to financial incentives, or strong regulatory and legislative frameworks. (Alice Mills, 2015)

In Ireland for example, a newly constructed residential dwelling must have level access, all areas of the ground floor must be accessible via widened doorways with ample turning circles within rooms. All sockets and switches must be within a certain height range.

To meet the stated objectives of providing a wide range of housing, we recommend that:

- **explicit guidance is provided to ensure that all new builds falling under PC 14 meet accessibility standards.**

In our experience, there are important trends in the type of choices that people want to make, that are not currently supported by our existing housing stock and will not be adequately enabled by PC 14. Principal amongst these is the inadequately scoped market for alternative housing options such as studio style and/or co housing . In our experience, there is strong demand for this type of housing, however, it does not appear that developers consider this housing typology an attractive financial proposition. (Generational changes and change in living choices post covid?) Our aging demographic and increasing proportion of people choosing not to have children mean that there will be a consistent growth in demand for these types of housing options and that it will take strong mechanisms to stimulate suppliers to recognise and respond to the demand. Importantly, for this style housing to deliver wellbeing outcomes, it is important that it has accessible green space and other amenity values.

An international example of a successful co housing project is Tree house , Los Angeles, USA. Founded in 2016, Treehouse is creating a new definition of home: one that is built around the intention to know your neighbour and be part of true community. Treehouse buildings are the vessels for community, intentionally designed to make way for shared moments of serendipity and togetherness. Every building features a range of private spaces – individual furnished bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms – and shared spaces – café, music studio, art atelier, library, lounge, and more – that empower residents to live, work, create and interact together, and bring all the offerings of an entire community under one roof. (about treehouse, n.d.). We also note that there are local and national examples offering similarly compelling insights through various papakāinga developments led by Iwi and hapū.

To meet the stated objectives of providing a wide range of housing, we recommend that:

- **explicit guidance is provided to ensure that the market delivers mainstream alternative housing options with accessible green space and appropriate amenity values.**

Social and affordable housing is typically grouped together on town and city fringes. It is widely believed that social housing negatively affects the value of neighbouring properties. In higher socio-economic areas where the concentration level of social housing tends to be low, the housing values are discounted by up to 6.5% within 250metres of social housing. In lower socio-economic areas where concentration of social housing tends to be medium and high, the housing values are discounted by up to 23% (Vernon Sequeira, 2020). However, international examples have demonstrated that social and affordable housing can be integrated within communities of mixed socio-economic position without negatively impacting

on housing values, if certain standards are upheld. Perhaps more importantly, these precedents also evidence deep and broad social gains from doing so, particularly in respect of social cohesion.

An international example of social cohesion through the build environment is in Vienna, Austria. Social housing in Vienna is available to people of all incomes. It's often built on government-owned land that's sold to a private company, which then owns and operates the housing units under public oversight. And crucially, social housing is placed in desirable areas and required to meet architectural and liveability standards that make it appealing to people across the income spectrum.

Those higher-income tenants pay market rents, subsidizing the cheaper rents reserved for low-income occupants. In Vienna, typically half of a building's units are reserved for low-income people. Rent costs don't fluctuate wildly year-over-year, in part because the government builds thousands of new social housing units each year, ensuring that supply keeps up with demand.

Today, social housing accounts for an estimated 40% of the housing stock in Vienna. (Scheitzer, 2020)

Closer to home, in an effort to create more affordable homes, Queenstown Lakes District Council have proposed a policy that would require most new residential subdivisions and developments to pay an 'affordable housing financial contribution'.

This money would be collected by Council and provided to the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust (or another registered Community Housing Provider), providing them with an ongoing funding stream to deliver their incredible work to provide access to affordable housing. (Inclusionary Housing Plan Change, 2023)

We consider that both the international and local examples warrant deeper consideration and that an aligned approach customised to Christchurch contexts and communities should be actively considered.

We are deeply concerned that continuing the pattern of socio-economic segregation will contribute to polarisation within Christchurch's broader community that ultimately undermines our collective and individual wellbeing. **Accordingly, we recommend that:**

- **explicit guidance is provided to ensure the integration of social and affordable housing in mixed communities.**

Additional Concerns-- Omission of Operative Mechanisms Policy supporting Innovation

Policy 14.2.45.2 encourages innovative approaches to achieving the objectives of PC 14 and creates a consultative/ participatory mechanism to doing so. In our view, while consultation is important and aligned with one of our proposed mechanisms for enhancing PC 14, we believe that it is incapable of supporting innovation. In our experience, innovation within urban design and the provision of housing needs a combination of necessity and prototyping. Christchurch has experienced the value of 'necessity by circumstances' following the earthquakes as well as the seemingly inevitable tendency for people to revert to conservatism in the absence of external triggers to innovate. In our view, the policy to be innovative will not be achieved unless the plan has directive operative provisions that stimulate and sustain practices of innovation. There are a range of processes that are known to support innovation in this sector and we strongly encourage deeper consideration of the appropriate mechanisms for our particular context. We place the highest priority on supporting innovation as the circumstances we are facing are pressing, and for many whānau dire. Our only solutions are to innovate our way forward into a different and more just future.

One of the options we consider warrants particular consideration is creating 'prototyping zones' under PC 14 that have appropriate rules that facilitate innovation. As far as possible, we would also encourage additional support from Christchurch institutions to support innovation and prototyping. We are mindful that a number of potentially inspiring prototypes for community housing developments ultimately failed, despite compelling propositions and more than capable leadership.

Colletts Corner, Lyttleton, as an example of a failed high profile attempt at an alternative housing model. Crowd funded with some 600 investors, the project folded due to lack of sales and rising costs. With respect for the potential value of this project, it is our opinion that this model failed as it lacked diversity at its core. An apartment block with few shared amenities and prices aimed firmly at the middle classes.

Similarly, the proposed Breathe Urban Village with its 88 eco friendly homes with shared spaces to be positioned in Madras Square, Christchurch, failed to come to fruition. Whilst the architecture was beautiful and theoretically was an urban utopia, the project ultimately also lacked diversity due to highly repetitious layout that disconnected people from greenery and shared spaces. In our view, the potential of this type of development is compromised by economic imperatives driving design with inadequate consideration of design for social objectives in parallel. We emphasise that we do not believe economic and social imperatives need to be positioned as trade-offs. With innovation, careful planning and enabling regulatory settings these objectives can be harmonised.

Importantly, to harmonise both outcomes, the physicality of the build, including spatial planning, sources of building materials, energy and service provisions are all important factors. However, directive regulatory settings are, in our view, necessary for these factors to be appropriately considered and enacted in the design process.

Accordingly, we recommend that:

- **prototyping zones are created within PC 14 with rules and aligned support that facilitates innovation and prototyping of new choices of housing.**

As a novel idea, we recognise that there are different ways it could be designed. One option is to allow for prototyping zones could be created with a reduced intended lifespan, which could be enabled under section 67 of the Building Act 2004, . This would allow alternative materials, building methods and services to be explored. This is valuable because the 50 year intended lifespan of a building falls short of some international standards, however the cost of compliance for new building elements / typologies in Aotearoa New Zealand is restrictively high. There is little or no motivation outside of academia to explore anything outside of the status quo.

Additional Concerns-- Inadequate Environmental Protections

We recognise that the current proposed rules govern a range of environmental factors, such as the amount of space, some landscaping features and the like. However, we believe that a more courageous stance could be taken to encourage and, in appropriate circumstances, require a higher standard of environmental performance in our housing stock. It is surprising, and problematic, that Aotearoa New Zealand with our '100% Pure' identity is failing to uphold common international standards of eco-responsibility. Given Christchurch's former positioning as a garden city and the increasing value of the 'red zone' and green space following the earthquakes, we believe there is significant value in taking a national leadership in eco-responsibility.

We also believe that we should have the courage of our values and identity. While we are able to look internationally to observe what other countries are doing to improve standards of eco responsibility, should we not be developing our own eco identity that is internationally admired?

Some of the provisions that we believe would be most meaningful in this area include:

- Rain and grey water harvesting / recycling
- Composting / incinerating toilets
- Alternative energy sources
- Green roofs
- Porous hardscaping

We also encourage consideration of reversing the current 'incentive' arrangement for eco-responsibility. Currently, many of our settings discourage property owners enhancing environmental performance. For example, those wishing to take care of their own black and grey water are required to apply and pay for a consent. This is a very real barrier to environmentally desirable conversions that seems, to us, back to front: it seems perverse that an owner must pay the council to NOT use existing resources/ infrastructure. We strong

encourage a more nuanced approach to setting an incentives scheme that supports and encourages, rather than suffocates and constrains efforts for greater environmental stewardship.

Accordingly, we recommend that:

- **The regulatory settings are regeared to incentivise, rather than discourage conversion to environmentally responsible design features**

Additional Concerns-- Exclusion of Specific Areas

Currently PC14 excludes certain areas on account of lack of adequate public transportation. These areas also align with the restriction of MDRS on account of natural hazards. We recommend that:

- Provision of public transportation should be explored to the outlying areas illustrated on the Map of areas where the MDRS would be restricted due to the Public Transport Accessibility Qualifying Matter.
- Temporary, modular lightweight housing / buildings should be explored in these areas, allowing the areas to flourish in the short – mid term, and enabling buildings to be relocated in the long term. This could also provide R and D possibilities for this type of building platform on a larger scale, including resource and infrastructure. Given the land mass instability of Aotearoa New Zealand, The research of this type of development en mass should be forefront of our minds.

Recommendations for Enacting Operative Mechanisms

We recommend that two approaches to operative mechanisms are considered:

- Intentional planning
- Explicit rules

Intentional Planning for Diversity

PC 14 could be amended to operationalise the objectives of diversity, responsiveness and affordability of housing through an intentional planning approach.

This type of planning approach could involve plans at a suburb level that:

- specify the mix of different types of housing, perhaps in the form of suburb specific caps for different bedroom numbers;
- create rules for mixed heights on sites of different sizes;
- targets for the volume of social and affordable housing; and
- create rules for distance from/ accessibility to community infrastructure.

We recognise that this proposal may be seen as encroaching on market principles and economic prosperity. However, we believe it is abjectly apparent that without parameters, the market alone will not deliver on core objectives of the plan to provide diverse, responsive and affordable housing.

We also note that creating suburb level plans may be considered onerous and impracticable. In our view, electing not to do so is merely a deferral and redirection of the burden of addressing the consequences and issues as they arise.

Operationally, it may be that there is value in exploring a panel of providers capable of developing such suburban plans according to an agreed process. Importantly, this panel would need to be organised in a way to not further embed patterns of status quo patronage. We believe there is value in exploring creative approaches that draw on emergent expertise (students) who have less constrained imaginations, as well as smaller practices. We also note that having civil engineers etc at the very outset of a design project can have a very different result than bringing them in after the architect has designed the area

Explicit Rules

An alternative approach is to create explicit rules within PC 14 that give effect to the objectives of diverse, responsible and affordable housing. It is beyond our resources to detail the full suite of rules that would be needed, however, we highlight the following as important starting points:

- Minimum numbers and caps of dwelling types, sizes and heights within certain geographical locations or building section
- Small clusters of mixed use areas
- A more fluid or organic approach to building set out on a section
- Affordable accommodations introduced into the wealthier suburbs rather than 'gentrification' (constantly pushing the socially disadvantaged further away from amenities and job prospects)
- More green space, through use of green roofs, planted areas etc as a main design directive rather than 'filling in the blanks'
- Parking areas serving a development, rather than parking spaces outside individual units. Parking areas can have bike lockers, charging points, rentable transport options and also act as a public transport stop location.
- No blocks of 'state housing' in its present form

Of these recommendations, we believe that small clusters of mixed use areas is the most important to consider deeply. Our reasoning is that there is international recognition that the 'small city' is a concept and scale of community in a severe state of distress, with some commentators going so far as to say that the 'small city is dead'. In present times how we live is changing arguably faster now than during the industrial revolution. Globally (especially post covid) we are now seeing entire town centres and cities becoming ghost towns. Despite investment, globally, over the last 20 years to reinvent the 'high street', our life and work patterns are being fundamentally reshaped by flexible working, online purchasing and the like. Whilst Christchurch needs to stop the lateral spread of the city, it also must be mindful to develop 'mini towns', or 'community hubs', where job opportunities, health services, recreational facilities and public transport are freely available.

It is our opinion that the future of the city is in a series of groups of diverse people inhabiting well appointed areas, (hence the small clusters of mixed use areas) encompassing a central

hub. This plan does not recognise the value of this planning and design concept, but we believe being fit for the future means that we should be embracing it and planning from that as the starting point.

Conclusion

The housing landscape as it stands in Aotearoa, New Zealand is not supporting the overall health and wellbeing of its inhabitants. As our density and urbanisation increases, it becomes increasingly poignant to improve our built environments. A holistic approach is needed to urban design in order to create a successful environment. PC 14 has objectives aligned to these principles, but it does not have the operative mechanisms to ensure that the objectives are realised. In a similar spirit to 'trust but verify', we need to both aspire and scaffold. We strongly encourage recognition that PC14 does not have the necessary scaffolding, and without it, PC14 will be incapable of fulfilling its stated objectives. We have made some recommendations that we believe could provide the necessary scaffolding and would value the opportunity to be heard in support of this submission.

References

Alice Mills, K. T. (2015). *Meeting the housing needs of vulnerable populations in New Zealand*. University of Auckland. Auckland: Transforming Cities. Retrieved 10 13, 2021, from <https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/auckland/creative/our-research/doc/urban-research-network/housing-vulnerable-groups.pdf>

Ministry of Health (n.d.) *Equipment and modification*. (2021, 07 22). Retrieved 10 13, 2021, from Ministry of Health: <https://www.health.govt.nz/your-health/services-and-support/disability-services/types-disability-support/equipment-and-modifications-disabled-people>

Scheitzer, Ally (2020) European-Style Public Housing Could Help Solve The Affordability Crisis

Standards, N. (2001). NZS4121-2001 accessibility. Retrieved 10 13, 2021

van Leijen, Robin (n.d.) About Aedes

vernon Sequeira, O. F. (2020). *Does concentration of social housing influence house prices?* Auckland. Retrieved 10 13, 2021, from https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJHMA-04-2020-0032/full/html?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=rss_journalLatest

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Tom **Last name:** Crawford

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: Flat 10, 74 Hansons Lane

Suburb: Upper Riccarton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8041

Email: tom.crawf31@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 28.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 28.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 28.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 28.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: James **Last name:** Broadbent

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 45 Norwood Street

Suburb: Beckenham

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8023

Email: broadbentj25@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: +64272406318

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Additional requirements for hearing:

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 29.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council***If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area***

Change the amendment in general to prevent unconsented 3 story development in residential suburbs. Specifically to prevent 3 story development in Beckenham, both street fronting AND back sections.

My submission is that

I live in Beckenham and I do not believe that unconsented 3 story development is suitable for our residential neighbourhood. Not only street frontage, but on all properties including back sections. 3 story intensification would reduce tree and grass cover, reduce 'spongy' water absorption in storms, reduce sunlight to neighbouring properties (even with the amendments proposed), place more strain on local infrastructure and basically be inconsistent with the current character of the suburb. Furthermore the whole concept is flawed, since if the object is to centralise residential housing and reduce commuting, why would you want more people living out in the suburbs? Christchurch is different from Auckland and other cities in that we have a large amount of vacant land in the central city. That is the only land that 3 story plus development should be allowed. NOT in residential suburbs, where 3 story blocks will stick out like sore thumbs amongst 1-2 story houses, gardens and treed streets. We must vigorously oppose flawed policy imposed upon us from central government.

Attached Documents

File

No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Murray **Last name:** Cullen

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 187B Waimea Terrace

Suburb: Beckenham

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8023

Email: m_cullen@chch.planet.org.nz

Daytime Phone: 0274387800

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 30.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I have read and support the Beckenham Neighbourhood Association submission

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Matt **Last name:** Pont

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 42 Toorak Avenue

Suburb: Avonhead

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8042

Email: mpont001@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 31.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 31.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 31.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Aimee **Last name:** Harper

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 315 Lyttelton Street

Suburb: Spreydon

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8024

Email: a.harper@windowslive.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 32.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 32.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 32.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 32.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: James **Last name:** Dunne

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 140 Hills Road

Suburb: Edgware

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Email: jamesdunne0108@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 33.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 33.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 33.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Georgia **Last name:** Palmer

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 7 Saunders Place

Suburb: Redwood

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8051

Email: gigglygeorgie@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 34.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 34.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 34.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

Original Submitter:
Original Point:

Points: 34.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Georgia **Last name:** Palmer

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 7 Saunders Place

Suburb: Redwood

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8051

Email: gigglygeorgie@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 34.5

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 34.6

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 34.7

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 34.8

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Suzi **Last name:** Chisholm

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 71A Wai-Iti Terrace

Suburb: Bryndwr

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8052

Email: chisholmsuzi@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 35.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 35.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 35.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 35.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Rod **Last name:** Corbett

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address:

Suburb:

City:

Country: New Zealand

Postcode:

Email: rod.corbett88@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: 027 433 8772

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Attached Documents

File

Christchurch City Council Submission

Christchurch City Council Submission re PC14 and PC13

My submission is that:

PC14: We oppose the proposed plan change for the block bounded by Riccarton Rd, Harakeke St, Kilmarnock St & the railway line to be designated HRZ (High-density residential zone) in place of its current Suburban residential transitional zone. As residents of Jane Deans Close, (which is within the block area named above), we know it to be a safe enjoyable cul-de-sac for many families who would be adversely affected by any six-storey development nearby. Six storeys may be appropriate within Christchurch CBD, but Jane Deans Close is not CBD and any change of designation is entirely inappropriate for this neighbourhood.

PC13: We also have a unique War Memorial within the Jane Deans Close cul-de-sac which must be preserved as a heritage item in memory of the members of the NZ 20th Battalion & 20th Regiment who lost their lives in support of New Zealand's freedom.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

PC14: That the current zoning for the block bounded by Riccarton Rd, Harakeke St, Kilmarnock St & the railway line be retained as it is currently: Suburban residential transitional zone.

PC13: For the existing War Memorial within the Jane Deans Close cul-de-sac to be preserved as a heritage item in memory of the members of the NZ 20th Battalion & 20th Regiment who lost their lives in support of New Zealand's freedom.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: James **Last name:** Ballantine

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 18K Forth Street

Suburb: North Dunedin

City: Dunedin

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 9016

Email: jamesballantine0225@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 37.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 37.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 37.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 37.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: G **Last name:** Wilson

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address:

Suburb:

City:

Country: New Zealand

Postcode:

Email: riccartonresidents@outlook.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Additional requirements for hearing:

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 38.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

Full submission attached. Submission relates to 6.1A, 14.5, 14.6 etc.

Ratepayers have not been provided with a satisfactory objective definition of “large town centre”. So-called “large town centre” is declared at the *whim* of council staff.

Staff have been busy spending ratepayer money enthusiastically trying to drum up support for intensification, especially on radio stations. Staff have shown their enthusiasm for their vision of intensification with the slogan they use: ‘Christchurch needs to grow up’. The people of Christchurch have already made it abundantly clear they do not want to live in high intensity boxes according to CCC’s own Housing Survey 2021. Reference: <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/how-the-council-works/reporting-and-monitoring/life-in-christchurch/housing/>

Attached Documents

File
CRRR-PLAN CHANGE 14 - May 3 2023 SUBMISSION
CRRR email

Cui, Aviva

From: CRRA <riccartonresidents@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 May 2023 2:31 pm
To: Engagement
Subject: Re: Proposed Plan
Attachments: PLAN CHANGE 14 - May 3 2023 SUBMISSION.docx

Attached is the Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc Submission on PC-14.

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

Someone will speak to this submission at the Hearings Panel. Please text details regarding the timing of the Hearings Panel to 021 171 8474.

Thank you.

G Wilson

Secretary, Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc

On 9/05/2023 8:33 am, Engagement wrote:

Mōrena Wilson,

Thanks for your email.

I went through the inbox again and I apologise that I could not find/missed your email. Can you please send the document again and I can submit to the correct consultation platform for you? Sorry about this and appreciate your time.

Nga mihi,
Aviva

Engagement

Communications and Engagement



03 941 8999



From: CRRA <riccartonresidents@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, 8 May 2023 6:47 pm
To: Engagement <engagement@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: Proposed Plan

We have NOT had our submission on PC-14 which was attached to an email sent to CCC on 3 May 2023 acknowledged. The submission came from the above email address.

G Wilson

Secretary, CRRRA Inc

On 8/05/2023 3:13 pm, Engagement wrote:

Kia ora,

I received an email this morning from our Plan team. And I want to clarify your enquiry so I can act on it.

Has the Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc successfully submitted or not? If so, please let me know the submitter's name so I can search on our backend.

Ngā mihi,
Aviva

Engagement

Communications and Engagement



03 941 8999



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 the email.



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 the email.



PLAN CHANGE 14 - May 3 2023 SUBMISSION of the Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission to: riccartonresidents@outlook.com

Our Association wishes to make submissions before the Hearings Panel.

Ratepayers have not been provided with a satisfactory objective definition of "large town centre". So-called "large town centre" is declared at the *whim* of council staff.

Staff have been busy spending ratepayer money enthusiastically trying to drum up support for intensification, especially on radio stations. Staff have shown their enthusiasm for their vision of intensification with the slogan they use: 'Christchurch needs to grow up'. **The people of Christchurch have already made it abundantly clear they do not want to live in high intensity boxes according to CCC's own Housing Survey 2021.** Reference: <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/how-the-council-works/reporting-and-monitoring/life-in-christchurch/housing/>

CCC should severely limit the zones/areas where intensification should happen in the Central City, defined as The Core and The Frame. That area would be more than enough for all the intensified housing needed in Christchurch. **Central Riccarton is NOT an emerging metropolitan centre - CCC have seen to that already by destroying the central Riccarton business precinct** with the removal of carparks, a slalom style road design cluttered with road signs above and at road level (sign pollution) and narrowing of lanes and a ridiculous bus lane which goes in and out of the single car lane with a result that there is a *multitude of empty shops and empty office space*. **Secondly**, there is no justification for completely limiting sunlight from neighbours. This is Christchurch, not Singapore or even Auckland. If the council staff "*advisors*" have their way, Riccarton Road would become a wind tunnel and because the business precinct is at Riccarton Road's narrowest point the footpaths would become dangerous to use because the frosts in winter would render the footpaths slippery all day since they would see no sun. Are the council staff "*advisors*" aware of the nature of a Christchurch winter? Obviously not. The proposed amount of green space between these buildings of 12 to 20 metres in height and the neighbouring properties effectively means there will be no space for clothes lines, hence more demand on power. Residents who have solar panels installed will not get enough sunlight to ensure solar effectiveness. **Central Riccarton is already the most densely populated area of all Christchurch with a density of more than 70 per hectare, far higher than what was the limit for medium density of 30 per hectare**, and does not have the infrastructure to cope with current intensification. As intensification has increased in central Riccarton, council staff have been stripping (or trying to strip) central Riccarton of its public facilities: a true Community Centre, library facilities, swimming pool complex, bus lounges and have reduced the size of the only public reserve in the area.

- **Sunlight Access** The changes made do not go far enough to safeguard mental and physical well-being of those Riccarton residents who live in single-level dwellings. Cutting out the sun makes houses unhealthy and more expensive to heat. Water, light and sunlight are recognised by all health experts to be essential for health - mental and physical well-being. The proposed changes do not provide the right to light and sunlight for those whose lives may be restricted to their residences due to age or disability.
- **Public transport access** There is a limited range of public transport in central Riccarton (currently large buses only when smaller much more nimble European-style buses would be

much more suitable in non-peak hours saving on fuel and road wear and tear) and access to any other form of public transport. If Riccarton Road is designated a rapid rail route this will destroy more businesses in central Riccarton.

- **Riccarton Bush Interface** There is a real fear in our area that the larger the qualifying matter of Riccarton Bush is will be compensated by further excessive intensification south of Riccarton Road even though residents in the qualifying area are *closer* to Westfield mall, the current Riccarton Road shops and what public transport there is along Riccarton Road.
- **Exemptions for internal garage setbacks** We oppose exemptions for internal garage setbacks.
- **Exemptions for street-facing glazing** We oppose these exemptions. We do not want windowless multi-storey solid block buildings hard up against the footpath making those footpaths very dangerous for pedestrians in a Christchurch winter.

Pathway for 60% site coverage in High Density Residential Zone We are resolutely opposed to a pathway for 60 per cent site coverage in a High Density Residential Zone because with multi storey buildings there will grossly insufficient *permeable* surfaces for run-off. Our fears are justified by the way Kainga Ora have been made exempt from intensification rules and at the taxpayers' expense have been building developments in residential areas where buildings are not greater than two storeys and well separated from one another and where there are abundant open spaces, playgrounds for children and extensive landscaping and tree planting.

- **Minimum two storey building height in High Density Residential Zone** We are utterly opposed to this provision. Why should current single level dwellings be compulsorily and forcibly dwarfed by multi-storey buildings with adverse effects on those single level dwellings? There is absolutely no justification.
- **Minimum unit size requirements** Is the city council going to allow virtually windowless 'hen cages' for human beings as are being built adjacent to Divine Cakes cnr Matipo St/Blenheim Road. Will the council staff also agree to very small units which will be used as drug dens?
- **Updated recession planes and exemptions** These are grossly inadequate to protect against loss of light and sunlight in Christchurch. [See *Sunlight Access* above]
- **Greater control for tree canopy cover** This provision is a sick joke. So developers are able to remove every tree and shrub on an existing site and pay a token monetary amount to the council which will plant trees in an area already well stocked with trees leaving our area DENUDED of tree cover.

CONCLUSION

Developers up to this point have been given free rein to do what they want because consenting has become PERMISSIVE in favour of developers. There are ridiculous justifications based on *staff* interpretation of "less than minor". Mr John Higgins and his team use the phrase 'mainly compliant' (*which, of course, means NOT COMPLIANT*) to describe consenting permission for developments which are outside what is permitted in the District Plan. Residents are NEVER consulted on these matters. And why do some developers even get to choose the Hearing Panel Chair they want? *Everything is stacked in favour of developers.* The permissive consenting is so ingrained that it has become PERVERSE consenting. The new provisions council staff want extended to our area and other suburbs will mean -

Christchurch will no longer be the Garden City but will become **an URBAN FOREST OF CONCRETE** if what the council staff want eventuates.

PLAN CHANGE 14 - May 3 2023 SUBMISSION of the Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission to: riccartonresidents@outlook.com

Our Association wishes to make submissions before the Hearings Panel.

Ratepayers have not been provided with a satisfactory objective definition of "large town centre". So-called "large town centre" is declared at the *whim* of council staff.

Staff have been busy spending ratepayer money enthusiastically trying to drum up support for intensification, especially on radio stations. Staff have shown their enthusiasm for their vision of intensification with the slogan they use: 'Christchurch needs to grow up'. **The people of Christchurch have already made it abundantly clear they do not want to live in high intensity boxes according to CCC's own Housing Survey 2021.** Reference: <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/how-the-council-works/reporting-and-monitoring/life-in-christchurch/housing/>

CCC should severely limit the zones/areas where intensification should happen in the Central City, defined as The Core and The Frame. That area would be more than enough for all the intensified housing needed in Christchurch. **Central Riccarton is NOT an emerging metropolitan centre - CCC have seen to that already by destroying the central Riccarton business precinct** with the removal of carparks, a slalom style road design cluttered with road signs above and at road level (sign pollution) and narrowing of lanes and a ridiculous bus lane which goes in and out of the single car lane with a result that there is a *multitude of empty shops and empty office space*. **Secondly**, there is no justification for completely limiting sunlight from neighbours. This is Christchurch, not Singapore or even Auckland. If the council staff "*advisors*" have their way, Riccarton Road would become a wind tunnel and because the business precinct is at Riccarton Road's narrowest point the footpaths would become dangerous to use because the frosts in winter would render the footpaths slippery all day since they would see no sun. Are the council staff "*advisors*" aware of the nature of a Christchurch winter? Obviously not. The proposed amount of green space between these buildings of 12 to 20 metres in height and the neighbouring properties effectively means there will be no space for clothes lines, hence more demand on power. Residents who have solar panels installed will not get enough sunlight to ensure solar effectiveness. **Central Riccarton is already the most densely populated area of all Christchurch with a density of more than 70 per hectare, far higher than what was the limit for medium density of 30 per hectare**, and does not have the infrastructure to cope with current intensification. As intensification has increased in central Riccarton, council staff have been stripping (or trying to strip) central Riccarton of its public facilities: a true Community Centre, library facilities, swimming pool complex, bus lounges and have reduced the size of the only public reserve in the area.

- **Sunlight Access** The changes made do not go far enough to safeguard mental and physical well-being of those Riccarton residents who live in single-level dwellings. Cutting out the sun makes houses unhealthy and more expensive to heat. Water, light and sunlight are recognised by all health experts to be essential for health - mental and physical well-being. The proposed changes do not provide the right to light and sunlight for those whose lives may be restricted to their residences due to age or disability.
- **Public transport access** There is a limited range of public transport in central Riccarton (currently large buses only when smaller much more nimble European-style buses would be

much more suitable in non-peak hours saving on fuel and road wear and tear) and access to any other form of public transport. If Riccarton Road is designated a rapid rail route this will destroy more businesses in central Riccarton.

- **Riccarton Bush Interface** There is a real fear in our area that the larger the qualifying matter of Riccarton Bush is will be compensated by further excessive intensification south of Riccarton Road even though residents in the qualifying area are *closer* to Westfield mall, the current Riccarton Road shops and what public transport there is along Riccarton Road.
- **Exemptions for internal garage setbacks** We oppose exemptions for internal garage setbacks.
- **Exemptions for street-facing glazing** We oppose these exemptions. We do not want windowless multi-storey solid block buildings hard up against the footpath making those footpaths very dangerous for pedestrians in a Christchurch winter.

Pathway for 60% site coverage in High Density Residential Zone We are resolutely opposed to a pathway for 60 per cent site coverage in a High Density Residential Zone because with multi storey buildings there will grossly insufficient *permeable* surfaces for run-off. Our fears are justified by the way Kainga Ora have been made exempt from intensification rules and at the taxpayers' expense have been building developments in residential areas where buildings are not greater than two storeys and well separated from one another and where there are abundant open spaces, playgrounds for children and extensive landscaping and tree planting.

- **Minimum two storey building height in High Density Residential Zone** We are utterly opposed to this provision. Why should current single level dwellings be compulsorily and forcibly dwarfed by multi-storey buildings with adverse effects on those single level dwellings? There is absolutely no justification.
- **Minimum unit size requirements** Is the city council going to allow virtually windowless 'hen cages' for human beings as are being built adjacent to Divine Cakes cnr Matipo St/Blenheim Road. Will the council staff also agree to very small units which will be used as drug dens?
- **Updated recession planes and exemptions** These are grossly inadequate to protect against loss of light and sunlight in Christchurch. [See *Sunlight Access* above]
- **Greater control for tree canopy cover** This provision is a sick joke. So developers are able to remove every tree and shrub on an existing site and pay a token monetary amount to the council which will plant trees in an area already well stocked with trees leaving our area DENUDED of tree cover.

CONCLUSION

Developers up to this point have been given free rein to do what they want because consenting has become PERMISSIVE in favour of developers. There are ridiculous justifications based on *staff* interpretation of "less than minor". Mr John Higgins and his team use the phrase 'mainly compliant' (*which, of course, means NOT COMPLIANT*) to describe consenting permission for developments which are outside what is permitted in the District Plan. Residents are NEVER consulted on these matters. And why do some developers even get to choose the Hearing Panel Chair they want? *Everything is stacked in favour of developers.* The permissive consenting is so ingrained that it has become PERVERSE consenting. The new provisions council staff want extended to our area and other suburbs will mean -

Christchurch will no longer be the Garden City but will become **an URBAN FOREST OF CONCRETE** if what the council staff want eventuates.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Rory Evans **Last name:** Fee

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 59 Greers Road

Suburb: Burnside

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8041

Email: roryevansfee@hotmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 39.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 39.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 39.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 39.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these

cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 39.5

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Steven **Last name:** Watson

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 10 Compton Street

Suburb: Woolston

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8062

Email: necrosius74@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 40.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 40.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 40.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 40.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Andrew **Last name:** Treadwell

Preferred method of contact

Postal address: 9 Mackworth Street

Suburb: Woolston

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8062

Daytime Phone:

I could not

Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not

directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :

a. adversely affects the environment, and

b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 41.1

Support

Oppose

Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to

Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 41.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 41.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 41.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Sophie **Last name:** Harre

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 12 Homebush Road

Suburb:

City: Glentunnel

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 7673

Email: bulldango@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 42.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 42.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 42.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 42.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Keegan **Last name:** Phipps

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: Unit 5, 107 Deans Avenue

Suburb: Riccarton

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8011

Email: keeganbhipps@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 43.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 43.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 43.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 43.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: fay **Last name:** Brorens

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 17 Moyna Avenue

Suburb: Dallington

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8061

Email: fborens@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: +64273246326

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 44.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

tree canopy

trees and natural spaces are important. A better balance of natural spaces within our denser city will improve our

connections with life.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 44.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

My submission is that

I support higher density.

I support precaution around Natural Hazards including, flooding, liquefaction and sea level rise.

Developments should consider infrastructure - in particular sewer. Above ground facilities such as public transport routes are more easily adaptable. I say this with our long skinny sections in mind. Maybe quality development in places such as Casebrook and South Halswell could provide better outcomes as we transition to more localised communities and neighbourhoods.

Sunshine is valuable - compensation?

Maybe if an existing home was to not have sunshine for 5 months of the year a one off payment could be made by the developer. (like the tree issue. Warm, dry and suitable homes are required. For the new dwelling a 'sunshine factor', is like a 'quality factor' or an 'outlook factor'.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Laura **Last name:** McGill

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 449 Bower Avenue

Suburb: Parklands

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8083

Email: laura@mcgill.net.nz

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 45.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 45.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 45.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 45.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Archie **Last name:** M

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: Flat 3, 360 Madras Street

Suburb: Christchurch Central

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8013

Email: archana.manur@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 46.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 46.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 46.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 46.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Michael **Last name:** Palmer

Preferred method of contact: Email

Postal address: 19 Te Wharau Lane

Suburb:

City: Charteris Bay

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8971

Email: pmknewzealand@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: 021922653

I could not
 Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
 directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
 a. adversely affects the environment, and
 b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 47.1

- Support
 Oppose
 Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I do not support these proposed changes as per my points below.

It appears the council is implementing a government initiative to address a housing shortage.

- There doesn't appear to be a housing shortage in Christchurch. The average household size in Christchurch has been declining since the 1990s and is the lowest of any major city in NZ.
- This will encourage an inappropriate scale of development in outer urban city suburbs, adversely affecting these neighbourhoods. Many white elephant projects will be conducted in a random way, such as a quite tree lined street with a small apartment block that fails commercially and changes the neighbourhood/streetscape permanently.
- We desperately need to complete development and rebuilding of the central city's vacant land to get more people living in the city centre for a number of reasons. However, considering the high cost of land in the city centre many developers will target outer suburbs first where land is cheaper causing perverse outcomes for both the city centre growth and the ambience of the outer city suburbs.
- A significant amount of character houses have been lost in the earthquakes, due to this proposal more will be removed for intensive development when there are more appropriate sites closer to the city centre.
- I generally support the government's recommendations for intensification planning rules only for suburbs surrounding the city centre including St Albans, Linwood, Philipstown, Addington and Merrivale. Considering the development underway in the post-earthquake city centre and these surrounding suburbs it is absurd to propose three, three story houses with 1m setback in Ilam or Hornby on a 400/600m2 section!
- Property/land prices in the outer suburbs will increase and the character will drastically change with only a few developments of this nature on each street, this will further incentive people to move out from the city to Selwyn and Waimakariri districts, for well planned neighbourhoods with the kiwi dream of neighbourhoods with backyards, suitable setbacks and recession planes providing sun, privacy and security.
- I believe that eventually a precedent will be made where a person will get a consent for maximum development as per this proposal for multiple houses, they could then change the consent to a single dwelling with slightly fewer constraints this would be deemed less than minor or a de minimis principle would apply hence the setbacks and recession planes specifically developed over generations of planners in NZ to enhance our standard of living will be lost.
- Development of sensible semi detached 2 story town houses in many areas may not be viable because the land will be able to accommodate much larger development, hence pushing up land values and stalling the sensible development of these areas because the small apartments that can be built will not be in demand or viable for development to this scale for many decades or perhaps longer.

- Aside from the Christchurch earthquakes this is the most significant change in the history of our city. 90% of people I have discussed this proposal with are don't understand how it will affect them, in fact they think I'm making up a story because it sounds unbelievable. For this reason when the development starts in random places to a scale people have never seen in the city before there will be serious public outrage.
- Although I find the existing planning process for development frustrating and onerous for property development in Christchurch I really appreciate the outcome and respect the process accordingly. The hard work and strategic planning conducted by the Christchurch City Council over generations will be disregarded causing random inappropriate development in many parts of the city.

On behalf of the people of Christchurch the Christchurch City Council need to challenge the government to defend our way of life and the character of our city encouraging an intensive housing strategy where it is needed and adapting accordingly as our population grows.

My submission is that

I do not support these proposed changes as per my points below.

It appears the council is implementing a government initiative to address a housing shortage.

- There doesn't appear to be a housing shortage in Christchurch. The average household size in Christchurch has been declining since the 1990s and is the lowest of any major city in NZ.
- This will encourage an inappropriate scale of development in outer urban city suburbs, adversely affecting these neighbourhoods. Many white elephant projects will be conducted in a random way, such as a quite tree lined street with a small apartment block that fails commercially and changes the neighbourhood/streetscape permanently.
- We desperately need to complete development and rebuilding of the central city's vacant land to get more people living in the city centre for a number of reasons. However, considering the high cost of land in the city centre many developers will target outer suburbs first where land is cheaper causing perverse outcomes for both the city centre growth and the ambience of the outer city suburbs.
- A significant amount of character houses have been lost in the earthquakes, due to this proposal more will be removed for intensive development when there are more appropriate sites closer to the city centre.
- I generally support the government's recommendations for intensification planning rules only for suburbs surrounding the city centre including St Albans, Linwood, Philipstown, Addington and Merrivale. Considering the development underway in the post-earthquake city centre and these surrounding suburbs it is absurd to propose three, three story houses with 1m setback in Ilam or Hornby on a 400/600m2 section!
- Property/land prices in the outer suburbs will increase and the character will drastically change with only a few developments of this nature on each street, this will further incentive people to move out from the city to Selwyn and Waimakariri districts, for well planned neighbourhoods with the kiwi dream of neighbourhoods with backyards, suitable setbacks and recession planes providing sun, privacy and security.
- I believe that eventually a precedent will be made where a person will get a consent for maximum development as per this proposal for multiple houses, they could then change the consent to a single dwelling with slightly fewer constraints this would be deemed less than minor or a de minimis principle would apply hence the setbacks and recession planes specifically developed over generations of planners in NZ to enhance our standard of living will be lost.
- Development of sensible semi detached 2 story town houses in many areas may not be viable because the land will be able to accommodate much larger development, hence pushing up land values and stalling the sensible development of these areas because the small apartments that can be built will not be in demand or viable for development to this scale for many decades or perhaps longer.
- Aside from the Christchurch earthquakes this is the most significant change in the history of our city. 90% of people I have discussed this proposal with are don't understand how it will affect them, in fact they think I'm making up a story because it sounds unbelievable. For this reason when the development starts in random places to a scale people have never seen in the city before there will be serious public outrage.
- Although I find the existing planning process for development frustrating and onerous for property development in Christchurch I really appreciate the outcome and respect the process accordingly. The hard work and strategic planning conducted by the Christchurch City Council over generations will be disregarded causing random inappropriate development in many parts of the city.

On behalf of the people of Christchurch the Christchurch City Council need to challenge the government to defend our way of life and the character of our city encouraging an intensive housing strategy where it is needed and adapting accordingly as our population grows.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 47.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I do not support these proposed changes as per my points below.

It appears the council is implementing a government initiative to address a housing shortage.

- There doesn't appear to be a housing shortage in Christchurch. The average household size in Christchurch has been declining since the 1990s and is the lowest of any major city in NZ.
- This will encourage an inappropriate scale of development in outer urban city suburbs, adversely affecting these neighbourhoods. Many white elephant projects will be conducted in a random way, such as a quite tree lined street with a small apartment block that fails commercially and changes the neighbourhood/streetscape permanently.
- We desperately need to complete development and rebuilding of the central city's vacant land to get more people living in the city centre for a number of reasons. However, considering the high cost of land in the city centre many developers will target outer suburbs first where land is cheaper causing perverse outcomes for both the city centre growth and the ambience of the outer city suburbs.
- A significant amount of character houses have been lost in the earthquakes, due to this proposal more will be removed for intensive development when there are more appropriate sites closer to the city centre.
- I generally support the government's recommendations for intensification planning rules only for suburbs surrounding the city centre including St Albans, Linwood, Philipstown, Addington and Merrivale. Considering the development underway in the post-earthquake city centre and these surrounding suburbs it is absurd to propose three, three story houses with 1m setback in Ilam or Hornby on a 400/600m2 section!
- Property/land prices in the outer suburbs will increase and the character will drastically change with only a few developments of this nature on each street, this will further incentive people to move out from the city to Selwyn and Waimakariri districts, for well planned neighbourhoods with the kiwi dream of neighbourhoods with backyards, suitable setbacks and recession planes providing sun, privacy and security.
- I believe that eventually a precedent will be made where a person will get a consent for maximum development as per this proposal for multiple houses, they could then change the consent to a single dwelling with slightly fewer constraints this would be deemed less than minor or a de minimis principle would apply hence the setbacks and recession planes specifically developed over generations of planners in NZ to enhance our standard of living will be lost.
- Development of sensible semi detached 2 story town houses in many areas may not be viable because the land will be able to accommodate much larger development, hence pushing up land values and stalling the sensible development of these areas because the small apartments that can be built will not be in demand or viable for development to this scale for many decades or perhaps longer.

scale for many decades or perhaps longer.

- Aside from the Christchurch earthquakes this is the most significant change in the history of our city. 90% of people I have discussed this proposal with don't understand how it will affect them, in fact they think I'm making up a story because it sounds unbelievable. For this reason when the development starts in random places to a scale people have never seen in the city before there will be serious public outrage.
- Although I find the existing planning process for development frustrating and onerous for property development in Christchurch I really appreciate the outcome and respect the process accordingly. The hard work and strategic planning conducted by the Christchurch City Council over generations will be disregarded causing random inappropriate development in many parts of the city.

On behalf of the people of Christchurch the Christchurch City Council need to challenge the government to defend our way of life and the character of our city encouraging an intensive housing strategy where it is needed and adapting accordingly as our population grows.

My submission is that

I do not support these proposed changes as per my points below.

It appears the council is implementing a government initiative to address a housing shortage.

- There doesn't appear to be a housing shortage in Christchurch. The average household size in Christchurch has been declining since the 1990s and is the lowest of any major city in NZ.
- This will encourage an inappropriate scale of development in outer urban city suburbs, adversely affecting these neighbourhoods. Many white elephant projects will be conducted in a random way, such as a quiet tree lined street with a small apartment block that fails commercially and changes the neighbourhood/streetscape permanently.
- We desperately need to complete development and rebuilding of the central city's vacant land to get more people living in the city centre for a number of reasons. However, considering the high cost of land in the city centre many developers will target outer suburbs first where land is cheaper causing perverse outcomes for both the city centre growth and the ambience of the outer city suburbs.
- A significant amount of character houses have been lost in the earthquakes, due to this proposal more will be removed for intensive development when there are more appropriate sites closer to the city centre.
- I generally support the government's recommendations for intensification planning rules only for suburbs surrounding the city centre including St Albans, Linwood, Philipstown, Addington and Merrivale. Considering the development underway in the post-earthquake city centre and these surrounding suburbs it is absurd to propose three, three story houses with 1m setback in Ilam or Hornby on a 400/600m2 section!
- Property/land prices in the outer suburbs will increase and the character will drastically change with only a few developments of this nature on each street, this will further incentivise people to move out from the city to Selwyn and Waimakariri districts, for well planned neighbourhoods with the kiwi dream of neighbourhoods with backyards, suitable setbacks and recession planes providing sun, privacy and security.
- I believe that eventually a precedent will be made where a person will get a consent for maximum development as per this proposal for multiple houses, they could then change the consent to a single dwelling with slightly fewer constraints this would be deemed less than minor or a de minimis principle would apply hence the setbacks and recession planes specifically developed over generations of planners in NZ to enhance our standard of living will be lost.
- Development of sensible semi detached 2 story town houses in many areas may not be viable because the land will be able to accommodate much larger development, hence pushing up land values and stalling the sensible development of these areas because the small apartments that can be built will not be in demand or viable for development to this scale for many decades or perhaps longer.
- Aside from the Christchurch earthquakes this is the most significant change in the history of our city. 90% of people I have discussed this proposal with don't understand how it will affect them, in fact they think I'm making up a story because it sounds unbelievable. For this reason when the development starts in random places to a scale people have never seen in the city before there will be serious public outrage.
- Although I find the existing planning process for development frustrating and onerous for property development in Christchurch I really appreciate the outcome and respect the process accordingly. The hard work and strategic planning conducted by the Christchurch City Council over generations will be disregarded causing random inappropriate development in many parts of the city.

On behalf of the people of Christchurch the Christchurch City Council need to challenge the government to defend our way of life and the character of our city encouraging an intensive housing strategy where it is needed and adapting accordingly as our population grows.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 &14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Brennan **Last name:** Hawkins

Preferred method of contact

Postal address: 40 Parlane Street

Suburb: Addington

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8024

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :

- a. adversely affects the environment, and
- b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 48.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to

Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 48.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 48.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 48.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Peter **Last name:** Stanger

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 11 Conway Street

Suburb: Somerfield

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8024

Email: prstanger@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 49.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 49.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 49.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 49.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I

seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Our proposed Housing and Business Choice and Heritage Plan Changes (13 & 14)

Submitter Details

Submission Date: 11/05/2023

First name: Charlie **Last name:** Lane

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: 1 Tapiri Street

Suburb: Parklands

City: Christchurch

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 8083

Email: cjlane123@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

I could not
Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am not
directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 50.1

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support the Tree Canopy Cover rules and Financial Contributions to restore our tree canopy. Trees are important in reducing emissions, providing shade and temperature control in the summer, alongside the other wide range of economic, health and social effects. I seek that the council retains the tree canopy requirement and contributions plan.

My submission is that

The council will require 20% of new residential developments to be covered by trees, or otherwise pay a financial contribution to help the council plant more trees on public land. Christchurch has an appallingly low tree canopy cover rate of 13% compared to Auckland (18%) and Wellington (30%). Trees have a wide range of environmental, health, social and economic benefits and are important for the future of our city.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 50.2

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Low Public Transport Accessibility Area Qualifying Matter as I believe that the public transport layout and network will need changes to prepare and accommodate future growth. We should not define future growth in Christchurch based on these routes. This would also artificially limit future housing in our city. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

The council plans to restrict housing in some areas of the city because they are poorly serviced by the lack of current high frequency public transport routes. Some areas solely designated with this qualifying matter such as in Casebrook and Styx are close to rail corridors, existing commercial areas and are serviced by low frequency routes. In the future, these areas could see a boost in service by more buses on current routes or introduction of a commuter rail service.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 50.3

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. There are many cities in the Northern Hemisphere that are further away from the equator and have a higher level of housing intensification than Christchurch. With a mix of medium and high density housing, these cities are considered some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would restrict medium density housing height and size in such a way that would create a less efficient usage of land and limit future housing. I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.

My submission is that

There are many cities in the world that have high density and are further from the equator than Christchurch. Cities such as Vienna, Copenhagen, Toronto, Geneva, and Calgary are consistently ranked some of the most livable cities in the world. This qualifying matter would reduce the maximum height and size of medium residential buildings below what is legally required. This qualifying matter has been developed with the expressed purpose of protecting and increasing property values rather than increasing the amount of affordable housing for people.

Original Submitter:

Original Point:

Points: 50.4

- Support
- Oppose
- Seek Amendment

I seek the following decision from the Council

If seeking to make changes to a specific site or sites, please provide the address or identify the area

I support high-density housing near the city and commercial centres. We need to allow more people to live near services and amenities to reduce car dependency. This would allow more people to take active and public transport to commute, shop and play. I seek that the council enable 6 to 10 storeys for residential buildings near commercial centres.

My submission is that

The council is required by law to allow residential buildings of at least 6 storeys within a 1.2km radius of commercial centres such as malls and the city centre. The council plan to enable this, while also allowing up to 10 storeys for residential buildings closer to the city centre. This would enable a wider range of dense housing development options. It would also allow more people to live close to services and amenities.

Attached Documents

File

No records to display.