

# Hon Chris Bishop

Minister of Housing  
Minister for Infrastructure  
Minister Responsible for RMA Reform  
Minister of Transport  
Leader of the House  
Associate Minister of Finance  
Associate Minister for Sport and Recreation



CB-COR1290

Phil Mauger  
Mayor of Christchurch  
Christchurch City Council

cc John Higgins  
General Manager Strategy, Planning and Regulatory Services.  
[john.higgins@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:john.higgins@ccc.govt.nz)

cc Mark Stevenson  
Head of Planning and Consents  
[mark.stevenson@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:mark.stevenson@ccc.govt.nz)

Dear Phil,

On 24 February 2025 I received a letter from you on behalf of the Christchurch City Council (the Council) referring twenty rejected Independent Hearings Panel recommendations and the Council's alternative recommendations to me for a final decision.

The recommendations relate to residential pathways, sunlight access, the Airport Noise influence area, the City Spine, Riccarton Bush interface area, zoning around Riccarton, Linwood, Hornby and the Peer Street local centre, building heights in and around Hornby and Linwood, 25 Deans Avenue, 231 Milton Street and 12 Johnson Street, the local centre intensification precinct, two heritage buildings, and a residential character area.

My decisions made in accordance with Schedule 1, clause 105 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), along with the reasons for my decisions, are set out in table format in Attachment A.

Please note I am not making decisions on the referred recommendations relating to Daresbury House, Antonio Hall and the Piko Residential Character Area at this time. This is because the Council has not yet made decisions on the zoning of these areas. I intend to consider these three referred recommendations once the Council has decided on the zoning of these areas. The Council may refer these decisions to me again ahead of deciding on the balance of Plan Change 14.

I want to thank the Councillors, the Independent Hearings Panel and Council staff for the work undertaken on the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process so far. I note there are further decisions for the Council to make on the remaining parts of Plan Change 14.

My officials have contacted the Council's staff to inform them of my decisions.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Chris Bishop'.

Hon Chris Bishop  
**Minister Responsible for RMA Reform**

## Attachment A: Accepted recommendations with reasons and alterations

| Accepted recommendation   | Reasons for accepting   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Matter 1:</b> Residential Pathways</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br/>The two residential pathways are not fully independent. A particular pathway can be selected for a development and then either pathway can be selected again for any future development.</p>  | <p><i>I consider the Council's alternative recommendation is not compliant with the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) as it does not provide for the medium density residential standards to apply to a site (as required by RMA section 77G) if a landowner selects the pathway that applies the pre-Plan Change 14 district plan provisions.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>Matter 2:</b> Sunlight Access qualifying matter</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br/>Reject the Sunlight Access qualifying matter, apply the medium density residential standard for height in relation to boundary of 4 metres and 60 degrees.</p>   | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD).</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to support the Council's alternative recommendation that sunlight access is a qualifying matter (within the NPS-UD policy 3 areas). By contrast, the IHP's recommendation is supported by evidence, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i></p> <p><i>Note my decision on this recommendation only relates the parts of Plan Change 14 the Council has made zoning decisions on.</i></p>  |
| <p><b>Matter 3:</b> Airport Noise Influence Area qualifying matter</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br/>The Airport Noise Influence Area qualifying matter means resource consent is required for developments with <u>four or more</u> residential units and the consent applications are limited notified to the Christchurch International Airport Limited, unless the Airport's written approval is obtained.</p> <p>This recommendation only relates to the parts of Plan Change 14 that the Council has made zoning decisions on.</p> | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD).</i></p> <p><i>The IHP's recommendation would better give effect to the NPS-UD, by providing additional permitted development capacity compared to the Council's alternative recommendation.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to support the Council's alternative recommendation regarding the Airport Noise Influence Area. By contrast, the IHP's recommendation is supported by evidence, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i></p> <p><i>Note my decision on this recommendation only relates the parts of Plan Change 14 the Council has made zoning decisions on.</i></p> |

| Accepted recommendation   | Reasons for accepting   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Matter 4:</b> City Spine qualifying matter</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br/>Reject the City Spine qualifying matter and apply the medium density residential standards front yard setbacks, being 1.5 metres for Medium and High Density Residential zones.</p> <p>This recommendation only relates to the parts of Plan Change 14 that the Council has made zoning decisions on.</p> | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD).</i></p> <p><i>The IHP's recommendation will allow for more development capacity than the Council's alternative recommendation.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to support the Council's alternative recommendation that the City Spine is a qualifying matter (within the NPS-UD policy 3 areas). By contrast, the IHP's recommendation is supported by evidence that has been tested through the hearings process.</i></p> <p><i>Note my decision on this recommendation only relates the parts of Plan Change 14 the Council has made zoning decisions on.</i></p> |
| <p><b>Matter 5:</b> Riccarton Bush interface area qualifying matter</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br/>Reject the Riccarton Bush interface area qualifying matter and apply the Medium or High Density Residential Zone to the areas that were proposed to be subject to the qualifying matter.</p>   | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The IHP's recommendation would better give effect to the NPS-UD, by providing additional development capacity in an area close to services and public transport.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to support the Council's alternative recommendation that the Riccarton Bush Interface Area is a qualifying matter. By contrast, the IHP's recommendation is supported by evidence, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i></p>  |
| <p><b>Matter 6:</b> Riccarton Town Centre Policy 3(d) catchment</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br/>Zone residential areas around Riccarton town centre High Density Residential and zone 25 Deans Ave Medium Density Residential</p>  | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 for Riccarton town centre to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to justify the change sought by the Council through its alternative recommendation.</i></p>   |

| Accepted recommendation  | Reasons for accepting  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Matter 7:</b> Building height for 25 Deans Avenue</p> <p><b>Christchurch City Council's alternative recommendation:</b> 25 Deans Avenue has a building height precinct applied that permits a building height up to 36 metres.</p> | <p><i>I consider the Council's alternative recommendation to be consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The Council's alternative recommendation would better give effect to the NPS-UD, by providing additional development capacity compared to the Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation.</i></p> <p><i>The Council's alternative recommendation is supported by evidence, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>Matter 8:</b> Hornby Town Centre Policy 3(d) catchment</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b> Zone residential areas around Hornby town centre High Density Residential.</p>                                   | <p><i>The Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation is more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 for Hornby town centre to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to justify the change sought by the Council through its alternative recommendation. By contrast, the IHP's recommendation is supported by evidence, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i></p> |
| <p><b>Matter 9:</b> Hornby Town Centre Zone building height</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b> Permit a building height of 32 metres in the Town Centre Zone of Hornby.</p>                                      | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 for Hornby town centre, which are to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i></p> <p><i>The IHP's recommendation for Hornby is also consistent with building height provisions for the other large town centres of Riccarton and Papanui, which both have 32 metre building height limits.</i></p>            |
| <p><b>Matter 10:</b> Hornby High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) building height</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b> Permit a building height of 14 metres in High Density</p>                                     | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 for Hornby town centre, which are to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i></p>   |

| Accepted recommendation   | Reasons for accepting  |
|---|--|
| Residential zoned areas around the Hornby town centre.  | <i>There is insufficient evidence to justify the change sought by the Council through its alternative recommendation. By contrast, the IHP's is supported by evidence, including the Council's section 32 evaluation report, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i>   |
| <b>Matter 11</b> Linwood Town Centre Policy 3(d) catchment<br><br><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br>Zone residential areas around Linwood town centre<br>High Density Residential, as per the Council's Right of Reply.  | <i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 for Linwood town centre to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i>  |
| <b>Matter 12:</b> Linwood Town Centre Zone (TCZ) building height and form<br><br><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br>Permit a building height of 22 metres in Linwood Town Centre Zone and apply the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard (4 metres and 60 degrees) along the boundary with residential zones. | <i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) for Linwood town centre, which are to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i><br><br><i>The IHP's recommendation for Linwood is also consistent the Council's NPS-UD policy 3(d) response for other town centres.</i>  |
| <b>Matter 13:</b> Linwood High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) building height<br><br><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b><br>Permit building heights of 14 metres in High Density Residential areas around Linwood town centre.  | <i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's (IHP) recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 for Linwood town centre, which are to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i><br><br><i>There is insufficient evidence to justify the change sought by the Council through its alternative recommendation. By contrast, the IHP's is supported by evidence, including the Council's section 32 evaluation report, which has been tested through the hearings process.</i> |
| <b>Matter 14:</b> Peer Street Local Centre Policy 3(d) catchment  | <i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development</i>   |

| Accepted recommendation   | Reasons for accepting   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b> Zone residential areas around Peer St local centre Medium Density Residential.</p>   | <p><i>2020 for Peer Street local centre to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>Matter 15:</b> Local Centre Intensification Precinct</p> <p><b>Christchurch City Council's alternative recommendation:</b> Retain the Local Centre Intensification Precinct, applying it to residential areas around eight local centres, whilst altering the provisions to align with the 12 metre building height limit recommended by the IHP.</p> | <p><i>I consider the Council's alternative recommendation to be more consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 which are to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>Matter 16:</b> 231 Milton Street and 12 Johnson Street</p> <p><b>Christchurch City Council's alternative recommendation:</b> The boundary of the High Density Residential Zoning for 231 Milton Street and 12 Johnson Street is modified to align with the current parcel configuration.</p>  | <p><i>I consider the Council's alternative recommendation to be consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, and more likely to lead to the efficient use of land and good urban form. The Council's alternative recommendation to remove the split zoning aligns the zone boundary with the property boundary.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to support retaining split zoning over 231 Milton Street and 12 Johnson Street.</i></p> |
| <p><b>Matter 17:</b> Papanui War Memorial Avenues</p> <p><b>Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation:</b> No additional matters of discretion for the Papanui War Memorial Avenues are included in the District Plan for decisions on intensification developments that require resource consent.</p>  | <p><i>I consider the Independent Hearings Panel's recommendation to be consistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</i></p> <p><i>There is insufficient evidence to support the Council's alternative recommendation regarding the Papanui War Memorial Avenues.</i></p>   |