

District Plan Review – Residential Chapter 14

Section 32 - Appendix 13

Overview of Consultation

Contents

A: PUBLIC FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM ON-LINE SURVEYS	3
B: PUBLIC FEEDBACK RECEIVED VIA PUBLIC MEETINGS AND EMAILS.....	5
Intensification - Riccarton	5
Intensification - Merivale	8
Intensification - Papanui	10
Intensification - Barrington	13
Intensification - Hornby	15
Intensification - Bishopdale	16
Intensification – Church Corner	18
Intensification - Shirley	20
Intensification - Linwood	22
Intensification – Unspecified as to which area	23
Policy regarding Lower Density development in Residential Suburban areas	24
Policy provision for intensification of Brownfield areas	24
Policy regarding increased housing supply and wide range of housing types	25
Provide for affordable housing	25
Encourage local energy generation, water capture, and stormwater waste water disposal at individual or neighbourhood level.	25
Reflectiveness of buildings.....	26
Places of Assembly	26
Pergolas.....	26
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design	26
Provision for a balance across age and family situation.....	27
Relocated buildings in Banks Peninsula	27

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Provision for collection of stormwater for re-use e.g. greywater	27
That the balance area of the Upper Styx Residential Growth area be included in Living G / New Neighbourhood	28
Retirement Villages	28
Fencing rules for Residential Suburban Zones.....	37
Vibration at construction time.....	37
Elderly Person Housing units	37
Minor dwelling units and conversion of 1 residential unit to two.	38
Detached Minor dwelling units.....	38
Landscaping in the Residential suburban zone.	38
Minimum floor areas for residential units.....	38
Life Mark and Homestar and Homestar.....	39
Travellers Accommodation	42
North Halswell Greenfield Development.....	43
Community Housing redevelopment mechanism	43

A: PUBLIC FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM ON-LINE SURVEYS

Proposed Direction:

The proposed direction of increasing density around key activity centres and larger suburban commercial centres was opposed by 60% and supported by 25% of respondents within the proposed intensification areas.

The proposed direction of increasing density around key activity centres and larger suburban commercial centres was opposed by 27 % and supported by 55% of respondents from outside the intensification areas.

Main Reason cited for <u>supporting</u> proposed direction:	
<i>Proposed Key Activity and larger suburban centre Intensification Area Respondents</i>	More houses in a location means people can live closer to shops, offices and community facilities
<i>General Public Respondents</i>	Will help reduce suburban sprawl (e.g. more efficient for transport networks)
Main Reason cited for <u>opposing</u> proposed direction:	
<i>Proposed Key Activity Area Intensification Area Respondents</i>	Don't like look and feel of medium density housing (e.g. looks cluttered, people living too close together, noise issues, loss of character, uniformity of housing is ugly, etc)
<i>General Public Respondents</i>	Don't like look and feel of medium density housing (e.g. looks cluttered, people living too close together, noise issues, loss of character, uniformity of housing is ugly, etc)

Additional comments (summary)

- **Polarisation between Affected Areas and Public respondents over medium density housing.**
- **Affected Areas respondents less likely to agree than Public respondents:** One quarter (25%) of Affected Areas respondents agreed with increasing the density of housing around some key commercial centres, a lower proportion than in the Public Survey (55%).
- **Over twice as many respondents in Affected Areas disagreed than in Public respondents:** Affected Areas: 61%; Public: 28%.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

- **Of Affected Areas respondents who agreed and who gave a reason, increasing density meaning more people living closer to shops and facilities was the most common reason:** Affected Areas: 73%; Public: 56%.
- **Of Public respondents who agreed and who gave a reason, helping to reduce sprawl was the most common reason:** Affected Areas: 62%; Public: 61%.
- **Of those who disagreed and who gave a reason, respondents said they don't like the look and feel of medium density housing:** Affected Areas: 87%; Public: 63%.

B: PUBLIC FEEDBACK RECEIVED VIA PUBLIC MEETINGS AND EMAILS

Public Comment	No.	Staff Comments	Response / Action
<i>Intensification - Riccarton</i>			
Overall concern / opposition .	Public meeting and email 76 Petition 79.	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries – including as substantial area for future investigation. Reduced to cover the area to the west of the centre that adjoins the existing Living 3 zone, and to an urban block to the north of the centre. Much of the remainder is reclassified as future investigation area. Some areas from the north of the centre are removed from consideration.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations. On going issues in the FIA areas can be addressed in investigations.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	20	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	22	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	
Concern / Opposition because of the cost of real-estate north of Riccarton Road	2	The real estate market will respond accordingly. The changes recommended are parameters in which the market will operate.	No specific change. But note that this is partly in a recommended Future Investigation area
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on Riccarton Bush and Riccarton House	5	The area adjacent to Riccarton Bush is a future investigation area this matter can be included in the investigation.	No specific change. But note that this is partly in a recommended Future Investigation area – and this can explored in the future investigation.
Concern opposition because of ‘crime’ effects.	5	A district plan only address ‘crime’ to the extent available through CPTED. CPTED would apply to the intensification areas.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on property values.	3	The real estate market will respond accordingly. The changes recommended are parameters in which the market will operate.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because development of TC 3 land is not viable	1	This is an economic consideration. The costs of foundations and remedial works will determine how viable intensification is. The draft plan sets the parameters in which the market operates.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because existing residents will be ‘forced out’ by changing demographics	2	Changing demographics is considered to be a reason why diverse housing is needed. There are no active measures to ‘force’ a person to move.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because existing stormwater issues will be made worse.	9	There are no known stormwater issues (other than some localised ponding) that would prevent intensification in the area.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because existing sewer issues will be made worse.	3	Any areas inside the Riccarton Waste Water Catchment area have either been removed or are in an Future Investigation area.	No specific change other than the deletion of areas and imposition of FIA.
Concern / opposition	10	The draft rules have landscaping requirements that serve to avoid or	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

because of loss of trees/landscaping.		remedy to the extent possible landscaping issues.	
Concern / opposition because of noise effects.	2		
Concern / opposition because of effects on access to daylight	5	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of effects of height of new buildings.	5	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of lower levels of service on community facilities like parks, halls, libraries.	1	The annual plan process determines whether levels of service of community facilities is appropriate. If intensification proceeds the annual plan process and the set levels of service within that process will determine appropriate needs for facilities.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because development will be of a low amenity or rental accommodation.	11	The urban design assessment for 3 or more residential units will ensure that incoming residential development will not be of a low amenity. Exactly how much rental accommodation will move into an intensification area will be function of the real estate market. However it is noted that rental accommodation is legitimate component of affordable housing.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on intensification in the Central City or should be in the central city	21	The Council must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. The RPS states that intensification will happen around key activity centres and the central city. The central city supplies one particular part of the market in relation to cost and location. Other intensification areas provide for a wider range of cost and location choices.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of questionable demand for higher density development.	4	See the preceding discussion regarding the Regional Policy Statement . Also the RPS requires a range of housing types including higher density development at levels greater than those currently provided.	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Concern / opposition because new growth should be directed to greenfield areas or other areas	1	The Regional Policy Statement requires that residential growth be apportioned between greenfield growth areas and intensification areas. The apportionment is to move towards a heavier emphasis on intensification than greenfield growth.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of privacy issues.	2	Higher density development has inherently lower levels of privacy. However the recommended standards re setbacks of balconies and windows and reduced heights will ensure that an adequate level of privacy amenity will remain.	No specific changes
Concern/ opposition because of storage of bins at the street.	1	The built form standards require minimum areas of storage waste on site. The issue of collection day bins will be prevalent on one morning a week. The need for sustainable disposal of household waste balances heavily against any perceived amenity effects for one day a week at the street level.	No specific changes
Supports subject to amenity controls	1	Noted	No specific changes
Neutral – wants other changes to intensification boundaries	1	Noted. Staff have reviewed the recommended boundaries of intensification areas – including future investigation areas.	No specific changes.
<i>Intensification - Merivale</i>			
Overall concern / opposition	13	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries. In acknowledgement of the existing medium density development around the centre, the residential medium density is reduced to focus on the urban blocks to the north east of the centre which are closest to the centre.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	6	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	7	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on property values.	2	The real estate market will respond accordingly. The changes recommended are parameters in which the market will operate.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on rates.	1	Noted	No specific change
Concern / opposition because development of TC 3 land is not viable	1	This is an economic consideration. The costs of foundations and remedial works will determine how viable intensification is. The draft plan sets the parameters in which the market operates.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because existing stormwater issues will be exacerbated.	2	There are no known stormwater issues (other than some localised ponding) that would prevent intensification in the area.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of loss of trees/landscaping.	3	The draft rules have landscaping requirements that serve to avoid or remedy to the extent possible landscaping issues.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because development will be of a low amenity or rental accommodation.	1	The urban design assessment for 3 or more residential units will ensure that incoming residential development will not be of a low amenity. Exactly how much rental accommodation will move into an	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		intensification area will be function of the real estate market. However it is noted that rental accommodation is legitimate component of affordable housing.	
Supports subject to amenity, lower height and 2 car park controls	1	The request for amenity controls is noted. In regard to parking statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	No change.
Concern / opposition because of privacy issues.	1	Higher density development has inherently lower levels of privacy. However the recommended standards re setbacks of balconies and windows and reduced heights will ensure that an adequate level of privacy amenity will remain.	No specific change

<i>Intensification - Papanui</i>			
Overall concern / opposition.	22	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries – including substantial areas for future investigation. The residential medium density zone is reduced to focus on the existing Living 2 zoned area and urban blocks closest to the northern end of the KAC. The area to the north is reclassified as future investigation area.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations. On going issues in the FIA areas can be addressed in investigations.
Concern / opposition because	6	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

of traffic concerns.		intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	3	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	No specific change
Concern because of historic associations with the area (St James / Windermere).	9	Much of this area is no longer recommended as an intensification area. The areas that is left is a future investigation area. The issue of the historic and memorial nature of the streets can be investigated as part of the future investigation areas.	Amend the planning maps as per the recommendations.
Concern because area contains a SAM	4	Special Amenity Areas have not been reviewed as part of the first stage of the review.	No specific change.
Concern opposition because of ‘crime’ effects.	2	A district plan only address ‘crime’ to the extent available through CPTED. CPTED would apply to the intensification areas.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on property values.	1	The real estate market will respond accordingly. The changes recommended are parameters in which the market will operate.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because existing stormwater issues will	5	There are no known stormwater issues (other than some localised ponding) that would prevent intensification in the area.	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

be exacerbated.			
Concern / opposition because existing sewer issues will be exacerbated	5	There are no known existing sewer issues.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of loss of trees/landscaping.	8	The draft rules have landscaping requirements that serve to avoid or remedy to the extent possible landscaping issues.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of lower levels of service on community facilities like parks, halls, libraries.	2	The annual plan process determines whether levels of service of community facilities is appropriate. If intensification proceeds the annual plan process and the set levels of service within that process will determine appropriate needs for facilities.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on intensification in the Central City.	2	The Council must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. The RPS states that intensification will happen around key activity centres and the central city. The central city supplies one particular part of the market in relation to cost and location. Other intensification areas provide for a wider range of cost and location choices.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because new growth should be directed to greenfield areas.	1	The Regional Policy Statement requires that residential growth be apportioned between greenfield growth areas and intensification areas. The apportionment is to move towards a heavier emphasis on intensification than greenfield growth.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of privacy issues.	2	Higher density development has inherently lower levels of privacy. However the recommended standards re setbacks of balconies and windows and reduced heights will ensure that an adequate level of privacy amenity will remain.	No specific change
Supports and wants area expanded to include other properties	2	Noted. Staff have reviewed the recommended boundaries of intensification areas – including future investigation areas.	No specific change
Neutral – wants other changes to intensification boundaries	2	Noted. Staff have reviewed the recommended boundaries of intensification areas – including future investigation areas.	No specific change
Neutral – wants to ensure that there is adequate parking available	1	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	
<i>Intensification - Barrington</i>			
Overall concern / opposition	17	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries – including as substantial area for future investigation. Reclassified as a future investigation area due to the strong correlation with the Enhanced Development Mechanism around the centre. The extent of the FIA covers a smaller area than that put out for public consultation with the focus on areas closest to the KAC and between the KAC and the existing Living 3 zoned area to the north.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations. On going issues in the FIA areas can be addressed in investigations.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	2	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change
Concern opposition because of ‘crime’ effects.	4	A district plan only address ‘crime’ to the extent available through CPTED. CPTED would apply to the intensification areas.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on property values.	1	The real estate market will respond accordingly. The changes recommended are parameters in which the market will operate.	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on rates.	1	Noted	No specific change
Concern / opposition because development of TC 3 land is not viable	2	This is an economic consideration. The costs of foundations and remedial works will determine how viable intensification is. The draft plan sets the parameters in which the market operates.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because existing stormwater issues will be exacerbated.	2	There are no known stormwater issues that would prevent intensification in the area.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because existing sewer issues will be exacerbated	1	Wastewater is an existing capacity constraint. Works to increase capacity are programmed but not currently funded.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of loss of trees/landscaping.	2	The draft rules have landscaping requirements that serve to avoid or remedy to the extent possible landscaping issues.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of noise effects.	1	Noted	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of effects on access to daylight	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of effects of height of new buildings.	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of lower levels of service on community facilities like parks, halls, libraries.	1	The annual plan process determines whether levels of service of community facilities is appropriate. If intensification proceeds the annual plan process and the set levels of service within that process will determine appropriate needs for facilities.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on intensification in the Central City.	1	The Council must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. The RPS states that intensification will happen around key activity centres and the central city. The central city supplies one particular part of the market in relation to cost and location. Other intensification areas provide for a wider range of cost and location	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		choices.	
General Support	1	Noted	
Supports subject to amenity controls	1	Noted. The package of rules has sufficient amenity controls to ensure a quality built outcome.	No specific change.
Supports and wants area expanded to include other properties	2	Noted. Staff have reviewed the recommended boundaries of intensification areas – including future investigation areas.	No specific change.
Neutral – has concerns about parking and daylight access	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Reduced height limits and daylight recession planes recommended.
Neutral – wishes to ensure that issues in relation to sewer, stormwater, discharges to the Heathcote, consultation, redevelopment of the central city, and preservation of SAMs resolved.	1	Noted.	
<i>Intensification - Hornby</i>			
Overall concern / opposition.	6	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries. The area of the medium density zone to the south east as put out for public notification is removed. The rest of the area is reduced to cover areas with the greatest accessibility to the KAC. Much of the remainder of the zone is to be reclassified as FIA.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations. On going issues in the FIA areas can be addressed in investigations.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	1	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	
Concern opposition because of ‘crime’ effects.	3	A district plan only address ‘crime’ to the extent available through CPTED. CPTED would apply to the intensification areas.	
Support because extended families can stay together.	1	Noted	No specific change
Supports subject to amenity controls	1	Noted	No specific change
Supports and wants area expanded to include other properties	1	Noted. Staff have reviewed the recommended boundaries of intensification areas – including future investigation areas.	
<i>Intensification - Bishopdale</i>			
Overall concern / opposition	13	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries. Significantly reduced to focus on the residential blocks closest to the east, south and west of the centre.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	10	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	3	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	
Concern opposition because of ‘crime’ effects.	1	A district plan only address ‘crime’ to the extent available through CPTED. CPTED would apply to the intensification areas.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on property values.	3	The real estate market will respond accordingly. The changes recommended are parameters in which the market will operate.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on rates.	1		
Concern / opposition because existing residents will be ‘forced out’	1	Changing demographics is considered to be a reason why diverse housing is needed. There are no active measures to ‘force’ a person to move.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of loss of trees/landscaping.	1	The draft rules have landscaping requirements that serve to avoid or remedy to the extent possible landscaping issues.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of effects on access to daylight	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Reduced height limits and daylight recession planes recommended.
Concern / opposition because of effects of height of new buildings.	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of lower levels of service on community facilities like parks, halls, libraries.	2	The annual plan process determines whether levels of service of community facilities is appropriate. If intensification proceeds the annual plan process and the set levels of service within that process will determine appropriate needs for facilities.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of questionable	1	The Regional Policy Statement requires a range of housing types including higher density development at levels greater than those	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

demand for higher density development.		currently provided.	
Concern / opposition because of privacy issues.	1	Higher density development has inherently lower levels of privacy. However the recommended standards re setbacks of balconies and windows and reduced heights will ensure that an adequate level of privacy amenity will remain.	No specific change
Neutral – Bishopdale Mall needs revitalisation	3	Noted	No specific change.
<i>Intensification – Church Corner</i>			
Overall Concern / Opposition	32 (including 14 signatories to the same email.)	This whole area is reclassified as Future Investigation area, to be reviewed when infrastructure capacity constraints are resolved.	That the entire Church Corner Intensification area be shown as a future investigation area on the planning maps.
Concern / Opposition – supporting the University over the needs of the community	1	The University is a major community facility and contributor the Regional Economy. Out of town students will require accommodation. Sufficient accommodation close to the university should be available.	No specific change.
Concern / Opposition – increase in density should be spread city wide.	1	The Council must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. The RPS states that intensification will happen around key activity centres and the central city.	No specific change.
Concern / Opposition – comprehensive planning needed.	1	The Council should engage in strategic planning for the intensification of the selected areas. This will include identification of servicing and community facility levels of service needs.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	6	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	3	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	No specific change.
Concern opposition because of ‘crime’ effects.	4	A district plan only addresses ‘crime’ to the extent available through CPTED. CPTED would apply to the intensification areas.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on rates.	1		
Concern / opposition because existing sewer issues will be exacerbated	1	Church corner is within the Riccarton Waste Water interceptor catchment area. This area has significant waste water capacity issues. Staff have reviewed the area and the waste water issue and determined that the area is not immediately available for intensification. The capacity issues will eventually be solved through capital works undertaken by the Council. When these works are to be undertaken has not been determined. Until the matter of stormwater capacity is resolved it is recommended that the intensification area be shown as ‘future investigation area’.	That the entire Church Corner Intensification area be shown as a future investigation area on the planning maps.
Concern / opposition because of noise effects.	1		No specific change
Concern / opposition because of effects on access to daylight	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of effects of height of new buildings.	3	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.
Concern / opposition because of lower levels of service on community facilities like parks, halls, libraries.	2	The annual plan process determines whether levels of service of community facilities is appropriate. If intensification proceeds the annual plan process and the set levels of service within that process will determine appropriate needs for facilities.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because development will be of a low amenity or rental accommodation.	2	The urban design assessment for 3 or more residential units will ensure that incoming residential development will not be of a low amenity. Exactly how much rental accommodation will move into an intensification area will be function of the real estate market. However it is noted that rental accommodation is legitimate component of affordable housing.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of questionable demand for higher density development.	1	The RPS requires a range of housing types including higher density development at levels greater than those currently provided.	No specific change
Support because student housing is needed.	2	Noted	No specific change
expand around Middleton Road or Hansens lane instead.	1	This is all Future Investigation area because it is in the Riccarton Waste Water Catchment Area.	No change.
<i>Intensification - Shirley</i>			
Overall concern / opposition.	5	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries. The extent of the RMD is reduced to urban blocks closest to the KAC. Most of the remaining area as put out for public consultation is reclassified to FIA.	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	1	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	1	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because development of TC 3 land is not viable	1	This is an economic consideration. The costs of foundations and remedial works will determine how viable intensification is. The draft plan sets the parameters in which the market operates.	
Concern / opposition because existing stormwater issues will be exacerbated.	1	To be further commented on.	
Concern / opposition because existing sewer issues will be exacerbated	1	To be further commented on.	
Concern / opposition to intensification in flood areas.	3	Future development will be subject to an adaptation strategy – e.g. higher floor levels to avoid inundation in large storm events.	No specific change

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

<i>Intensification - Linwood</i>			
Overall concern / opposition.	10	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries. The medium density zone is reduced in size to focus on urban blocks closest to the KAC and where there is greatest correlation with the Enhanced Development Mechanism. Part of the area is reclassified as future investigation area.	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns.	1	Intensification may increase traffic volumes in and near the intensification area. However overall across the city the increase in traffic volumes will be less than if the new residential population growth was put solely into Greenfield Areas. Residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and generally have shorter distances to travel to shops, schools and workplaces. So intensification areas generally generate less traffic per person than greenfield areas.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on street parking.	1	Statistics show that residents in intensification areas generally own less cars than residents in other parts of the city. This is because residents in intensification areas generally have more active and public transport options and thus are not as car dependent as other parts of the city. So there is generally less parking demand per house in intensification areas than in other parts of the city. Houses in intensification areas will still need to provide at least one off-street carpark per house. Currently in the operative City Plan most houses in intensification areas are only required to provide one off-street carpark per house. Currently on-street parking issues in the City are generally caused by parking demand from commercial areas over spilling into residential areas, rather than being caused by intensification. If there are on-street parking issues caused by intensification then changes may need to be made to Council’s on-street parking operational management in the area.	No specific change
Concern / opposition because of effects on access to daylight	1	There is the potential for existing properties to be adversely affected by high closer development. A change to the rules package regarding height and recession planes being commensurate with the surrounding existing zoning is recommended.	Amend the rules to bring in existing prevailing height and recession plane rules.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Concern / opposition because of lower levels of service on community facilities like parks, halls, libraries.	1	The annual plan process determines whether levels of service of community facilities is appropriate. If intensification proceeds the annual plan process and the set levels of service within that process will determine appropriate needs for facilities.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because development will be of a low amenity or rental accommodation.	1	The urban design assessment for 3 or more residential units will ensure that incoming residential development will not be of a low amenity. Exactly how much rental accommodation will move into an intensification area will be function of the real estate market. However it is noted that rental accommodation is legitimate component of affordable housing.	No specific change.
Concern / opposition because of adverse effects on intensification in the Central City.	1	The Council must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. The RPS states that intensification will happen around key activity centres and the central city. The central city supplies one particular part of the market in relation to cost and location. Other intensification areas provide for a wider range of cost and location choices.	No specific change
Support because people can stay in the neighbourhood	1	Noted.	
Supports and wants area expanded to include other properties	3	Noted. Staff have reviewed the recommended boundaries of intensification areas – including future investigation areas.	
<i>Intensification – Unspecified as to which area</i>			
Overall concern / opposition.	2	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and are recommending new boundaries – including as substantial area for future investigation.	Amend the planning maps in accordance with staff recommendations. On going issues in the FIA areas can be addressed in investigations.
Support – change all of L2 to	1	Staff have reviewed boundaries, taking into account feedback, and	Amend the planning

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Medium density in Papanui, Riccarton, Upper Riccarton and Shirley		are recommending new boundaries – including as substantial area for future investigation.	maps in accordance with staff recommendations. On going issues in the FIA areas can be addressed in investigations.
Concern opposition – encourage intensification in Central City instead outer areas	1	The Council must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. The RPS states that intensification will happen around key activity centres and the central city. The central city supplies one particular part of the market in relation to cost and location. Other intensification areas provide for a wider range of cost and location choices.	No specific change
A sustainable building organisation supports increased residential densities	1	Noted	No specific change.

<i>Policy regarding Lower Density development in Residential Suburban areas</i>			
A sustainable building organisation opposes this policy as it believes all areas should increase density.	1	Noted. The strategy towards intensification is in accordance with that outlined in the Urban Development Strategy, the Regional Policy Statement, and the Land Use Recovery Plan	No specific change.

<i>Policy provision for intensification of Brownfield areas</i>			
A sustainable building organisation believes this needs to be addressed directly in policy for the Residential Chapter.	1	The potential for redevelopment of Brownfield sites is acknowledged and the Strategic Directions Chapter acknowledges redevelopment of suitable sites is desirable. However the investigation of suitable sites has not been undertaken as part of the first phase of the District Plan review. Not all sites are suitable – some will be subject to contamination and some will have existing non residential activities that would be subject to reverse sensitivity effects in the land were rezoned.	That it be noted that appropriate investigation will be undertaken in due course and suitable Brownfield land for rezoning will be

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

			identified in due course.
--	--	--	---------------------------

<i>Policy regarding increased housing supply and wide range of housing types</i>			
A sustainable building organisation supports this policy.	1	Noted	No specific change.

<i>Provide for affordable housing</i>			
A sustainable building organisation suggests that the Council look to overseas examples for funding and delivery of affordable housing.	1	It is agreed that provision of affordable housing is a major concern. Such mechanisms sit outside the City Plan. More direct regulatory intervention is possible – but as discussed in the Section 32 document for the Residential Chapter these direct mechanisms have not been recommended.	No specific change.

<i>Encourage local energy generation, water capture, and stormwater waste water disposal at individual or neighbourhood level.</i>			
A sustainable building organisation suggests that the Council look to overseas examples for funding and delivery of affordable housing and that this be supported in policy – not just in Banks Peninsula.	1	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Rainwater capture is provided for in Banks Peninsula in sensitive water catchments.</p> <p>Phase 1 of the City Plan review has not reviewed other mechanisms except for the general capture of stormwater in rain tanks. That review has determined however that Christchurch stormwater environment is complex and that a blunt approach of capture of stormwater on site is not necessarily appropriate. This report is appended to the Section 32 material.</p> <p>Other options have not been explored as part of Phase 1.</p>	No specific change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

<i>Reflectiveness of buildings</i>			
No provisions in the plan to control the reflectiveness of buildings – particularly roofing	1	Staff have not investigated the need for a reflectivity rule.	No change.

<i>Places of Assembly</i>			
Concern that a definition of Places of Assembly had not been included	1	At the time of consultation a definition of places of assembly was under development. That definition has now been included.	That the definition of place of assembly be included in the draft District Plan.
No need to regulate the hours of Church Services – example given of Catholic Midnight mass etc.	1	The hours of operation are suitable to Place of Assembly operation in Residential Zones. Longer operating hours may be appropriate in other areas.	No change.
Limiting hours of operation for halls could cause problems for community organisations.	1	The hours of operation are suitable to Place of Assembly operation in Residential Zones. Longer operating hours may be appropriate in other areas.	No change.

<i>Pergolas</i>			
Pergolas should not be considered as part of site coverage.	1	Pergolas have the potential to covered thus adding to site coverage.	No change.

<i>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design</i>			
Concern about the use of the terms “accords with” and the principles of “CPTED”.	1	To be responded to following the technical review process.	

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Replace with the term “Apply best practice CPTED throughout the development design phases and in the built landscape environment”			
Concern that CPTED is not referred to in the	1	To be responded to following the technical review process.	
Support for the use of CPTED in the Residential Chapter	1	Noted.	

<i>Provision for a balance across age and family situation.</i>			
Concern / opposition that insufficient provision is made in the residential chapter for a balance across age and family situation.	1	Intensification, mix of residential unit types, minor dwelling unit provisions and Lifemark standards provide for a balance across age and family situation	No change.

<i>Relocated buildings in Banks Peninsula</i>			
Provisions for relocated buildings should remain.	1	Noted, however as the draft plan no longer provides for controlled activities the consent status has been changed to restricted discretionary.	Relocate-able building consent status changes from controlled to restricted discretionary.

<i>Provision for collection of stormwater for re-use e.g. greywater</i>			
Concern / opposition that this has not been included.	1	Provision in terms of retention of stormwater on site in Banks Peninsula zones has been made.	No change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Removal of Port Noise Overlay from Norwich Quay Banks Peninsula			
Concern / opposition that the overlay is not needed on Norwich Quay	1	Actual changes to the extent of the Port Noise Overlay provisions are a Stage 2 of the review matter.	That the matter be noted for review as part of the Phase 2 review.
Concern / opposition to the no complaint covenants related to the Port Noise Overlay	1	Actual changes to the Port Noise Overlay provisions are a Stage 2 of the review matter.	That the matter be noted for review as part of the Phase 2 review.

<i>That the balance area of the Upper Styx Residential Growth area be included in Living G / New Neighbourhood</i>			
<p>The comment notes that there is sufficient detail in the Outline Development Plan that was included in the City Plan by the LURP in December 2013 and background investigation work for the balance area of the Upper Styx residential growth area to be included in planning maps and allowed to develop.</p> <p>Other comments are made in relation to the proposed New Neighbourhood rules.</p>	1	<p>On its face there is some merit in this request. However changes to Living G have been deferred to the second phase of the district plan review.</p> <p>Response to the comments on the New Neighbourhood rules will be made in the forth coming subdivision workshop.</p>	That the matter be noted for review as part of the Phase 2 review.

<i>Retirement Villages</i>			
Policy for Non-household residential accommodation,	1	A separate policy in regard to retirement villages is recommended and that the word complex be deleted and replaced with village.	Insert new policy in regard to retirement

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

retirement villages and provision of housing for elderly persons could be improved by replacing ‘complexes’ in the policy with ‘villages’			villages.
Policy for Non-household residential accommodation, retirement villages and provision of housing for elderly persons where it refers to ‘surrounding residential area’. Some proposed retirement complexes might not have residential development around them.	1	There is some merit to this argument the policy could be amended to ‘... <i>any</i> surrounding residential environment.’	Amend Policy 14.1.1.3 to read ‘... <i>any</i> surrounding residential environment.’
That the definition of retirement villages be used and that it be the same as the definition in the Retirement Villages Act 2003	2	This is a statutory definition. Where possible it is good practice to use a legal definition. This definition is used in the Auckland Unitary Plan.	Amend definition to refer to the Retirement Villages Act definition.
That retirement villages be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in Living G and New Neighbourhoods in the same way that they are provided for as restricted discretionary activities in the other residential zones.	1	There is merit to this argument. Retirement Villages can be comprehensively planned under the restricted discretion to ‘fit’ with the New Neighbourhood.	Amend the Restricted Discretionary Activity Table for New Neighbourhoods to include Retirement Villages, subject to the relevant New Neighbourhood and the assessment matters relevant to the residential zones.
A retirement village providers association suggests that existing retirement villages be	1	The draft city plan does not have controlled activities. Existing retirement villages can operate either under existing use rights or within the built form standards as discussed in responses below.	No change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

<p>provided for as an overlay or as controlled activities.</p>		<p>Changes that are outside of existing use rights can be assessed as restricted discretionary activity as set out in the draft and a discussed in the responses below.</p>	
<p>A retirement Village providers association notes that the Retirement Villages Act 2003 has a definition of a retirement village and that this should be the definition used in the City Plan instead of Elderly Persons Retirement Village.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Given that there is a statutory definition of a retirement village and that Act controls and defines the operation of retirement villages as a City Plan specific definition is no longer considered to be necessary or appropriate.</p> <p>The association recommends that the Council adopt the definition of a Retirement Village as set out in the Auckland City Unitary Plan.</p> <p>A new definition should read:</p> <p>Retirement Village means:</p> <p>a. a comprehensive residential development used to provide accommodation for older people. b. a retirement village as defined in s.6 of the Retirement Villages Act 2003. c. recreation, leisure, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non residential activities accessory to the retirement village.</p> <p>The Retirement Villages are defined by Section 6 of the RVA 2003, which reads:</p> <p><i>6 Meaning of retirement village</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1) In this Act, but subject to subsections (2) to (6), retirement village means the part of any property, building, or other premises that contains 2 or more residential units that provide, or are intended to provide, residential accommodation together with services or facilities, or both, predominantly for persons in their retirement, or persons in their retirement and their spouses or partners, or both, and for which the residents pay, or agree to pay, a capital sum as consideration and regardless of whether— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (a) a resident's right of occupation of any residential unit is provided by way of freehold or leasehold title, crosslease title, unit title, lease, licence to occupy, 	<p>Delete the definition of Elderly Persons Retirement Village and replace it with the suggested definition for Retirement Village.</p> <p>Delete definition of Elderly Person.</p>

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		<p><i>residential tenancy, or other form of assurance, for life or any other term; or</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(b) the form of the consideration for that right is a lump sum payment or deduction, or a contribution or a payment in kind of any form, a periodic payment or deduction, or any combination of such payments or deductions, whether made before, during, or after occupancy; or</i> • <i>(c) the consideration is actually paid or agreed to be paid by a particular resident or particular residents or on behalf of that resident or those residents, or by another person for the benefit of that resident or those residents; or</i> • <i>(d) the resident makes an additional payment or periodical payment (for example, a service fee) for any services or facilities or access to such services or facilities; or</i> • <i>(e) the services or facilities, or both, are provided by the owner of the property, building, or other premises, or by any other person under an arrangement with the operator of the village.</i> <p><i>(2) A retirement village includes any common areas and facilities to which residents of the retirement village have access under their occupation right agreements.</i></p> <p><i>(3) Despite subsections (1) and (2), if 1 or more of the residential units referred to in subsection (1) are located in a rest home or hospital care institution, the only parts of that rest home or hospital care institution that comprise, or are included in, the retirement village are—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(a) the residential unit or units themselves; and</i> • <i>(b) the common areas and facilities within the rest home or hospital care institution (if any) to which the resident or residents of the unit or units have access only by</i> 	
--	--	---	--

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		<p><i>reason of their occupation right agreement.</i></p> <p><i>(4) For the avoidance of doubt, the following are not retirement villages for the purposes of this Act:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(a) owner-occupied residential units registered under the <u>Unit Titles Act 2010</u> or owner-occupied cross-lease residential units that in either case do not provide services or facilities to their occupants beyond those commonly provided by—</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(i) similar residential units that are not intended to provide accommodation predominantly for retired people and their spouses or partners; or</i> • <i>(ii) residential units occupied under tenancies to which the <u>Residential Tenancies Act 1986</u> applies:</i> • <i>(b) boarding houses, guest houses, or hostels:</i> • <i>(c) halls of residence associated with educational institutions.</i> <p><i>(5) Whether or not a property or building is, or any other premises are, a retirement village must be determined according to the nature, substance, and economic effect of the operation of the property, building, or premises and other facts, and independently of its or their form or description in any document.</i></p> <p><i>(6) For the avoidance of doubt,—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(a) a property, building, or other premises does not cease to be a retirement village by reason only that persons in their retirement cease to predominate amongst residents of the village:</i> • <i>(b) a retirement village does not include any land or building that is under development as a retirement village, or as part of a retirement village, that is not occupied by any resident.</i> <p><i>(7) This section must be read in conjunction with <u>section 103</u> (which authorises the making of regulations declaring specified</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		<p><i>property, buildings, or other premises, or property, buildings, or other premises of a specified class, to be or not to be a retirement village for the purposes of this Act).</i></p> <p>The RVA 2003 definition is comprehensive and a. and c. are not considered to be necessary.</p> <p>The definition should read.</p> <p><i>Retirement Village</i> <u><i>Means a retirement village as defined in s.6 of the Retirement Villages Act 2003.</i></u></p> <p>Associated with this issue is the definition of Elderly Person it is recommended that this be deleted entirely as it would no longer be necessary.</p> <p>The term Elderly Persons Housing Unit needs to remain because there are Land Use Recovery Plan actions that pertaining to existing Elderly Persons Housing.</p> <p>Note that Elderly Persons Housing Units are not provided for in the Draft City Plan. Other enabling City Plan provisions compensate for the removal of elderly persons housing unit provisions.</p>	
<p>A retirement village providers association notes that the term ‘Elderly’ is inappropriate as some people who fall within the category may not consider themselves to be ‘elderly’. The association suggests that the term be changed for ‘age qualifying’, through out the plan.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>It is agreed that the term ‘elderly’ is problematic. With the recommended change to the definition the term elderly is no longer required in relation to retirement villages.</p>	<p>See preceding recommendation on definition on Elderly Persons Retirement Village.</p>
<p>A retirement village providers association</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>With the recommended change to the definition an age qualifier is no longer required.</p>	<p>See preceding recommendation on definition on Elderly</p>

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

<p>suggests that if an age qualifier is needed that this be 80.</p>			<p>Persons Retirement Village</p>
<p>A retirement village providers association suggests that the restricted discretionary activity status for retirement villages in all residential zones is ‘realistic’ but recognition needs to be given to the more intensive nature of retirement villages in the built form standards.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The support for the consent status is noted. The next panel discusses the appropriateness of built form standards to retirement villages.</p>	<p>That the support for the Restricted Discretionary Activity status is noted.</p>
<p>A major Retirement Village provider and a retirement village providers association has requested changes to the Residential Chapter Objectives and Policies to give greater recognition to the aging population and their stated needs in terms of built form. Specific changes discussed under staff response.</p> <p>The provider does not comment on the rules structure. However as a general theme the provider argues that retirement villages should not be subject to requirements to ‘fit’ within existing character and context because they are</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that New Zealand, in general, has a rapidly aging population and that provision for lifestyle choices for those nearing, at, or over retirement age are needed. Recognition and appropriate provision for housing suitable for this sector of the population is appropriate. This recognition needs to be balanced against the wider objectives of the City Plan.</p> <p>The draft City Plan maintains the premise that different zones have different characters and densities and that development generally within those characters should be maintained.</p> <p>The draft plan provides for Elderly Person’s Retirement Villages as a restricted discretionary activity in all residential zones. They are assessed against urban design and scale of activity assessment matters. This is considered to be an appropriate and balanced level of enablement of this type of activity. The activity status recognises that elderly person’s retirement villages are appropriate throughout the residential sector of the City – where they can integrate appropriately. Part of that integration is compliance with prevailing built form standards.</p> <p>However the draft plan already recognises that some built form standards in the residential suburban zone are not appropriate for development of specific specialist complexes (these are Multi-Unit residential complexes and Multi-Unit Social Housing Complexes) and allowances are made for</p>	<p>Amend the Objectives and Policies as recommended and make changes to the Site density, Outdoor Living Space, Site Coverage Standards in the Residential suburban zone so that they are commensurate with the standards for Multi-Unit Residential Complexes and Multi-Unit Social Housing Complexes.</p>

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

<p>critical facilities, have specialist needs are built at a higher density, and that being required to ‘fit’ makes establishment of their complexes difficult.</p> <p>The retirement villages providers association notes that some built form standards are problematic for them. Standards such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. maximum gross floor area. b. maximum permitted height of 8m c. Maximum permitted site coverage of 35%. d. Maximum outdoor living space requirement of 90m² e. Minimum internal setbacks 1.8m f. minimum setback from road boundaries 4.5m g. maximum impervious surface are 60%. 		<p>them in terms of density (no minimum net area), reduced outdoor living space requirements (30m²), and site coverage (40%). Additional requirements are made for tree and garden planting. It is recommended that these allowances and the extra landscaping also apply to Retirement Villages.</p> <p>The maximum gross floor area of buildings (concern a.) is no longer recommended for other reasons.</p> <p>The maximum impervious surface rule (concern g.) is no longer recommended for other reasons</p> <p>The maximum permitted height limit of 8m (concern b.) for the residential suburban zone is considered to be appropriate to the residential suburban zone context and should remain. (This allows for a two storey building.)</p> <p>In terms of Objectives and Policies the specific provider has requested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Objective 1 Housing Supply read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u><i>An increased supply and wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities, to meet the diverse needs of the community in the immediate recovery period and longer term including affordable, social, elderly, and temporary housing options.</i></u> <p>Staff have restructured the Objective in the technical review process, nevertheless recognition in the Objective is still appropriate. The objective should read:</p> <p><i>An increase supply that will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. enable a wide range of housing types, sizes and densities; b. meet the diverse needs of the community in the immediate recovery period and longer term including social, elderly persons, and temporary housing options; and c. assist in improving housing affordability. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The provider requests changes to the housing distribution and density objective. However this objective focuses on the rational for different 	
--	--	--	--

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

	<p>density areas within the City. Elderly persons facilities are not an ‘area’ in this context so the requested changes are not recommended.</p> <p>3. The provider requests a new objective that reads:</p> <p><i>Efficient use of land to provide a range of accommodation options and accessory services of older people and those requiring care/assisted living.</i></p> <p>And new Policies that read:</p> <p>Under location density and type of housing:</p> <p><i>(e) High density elderly persons housing is enabled throughout all residential zones while ensuring any adverse effects on infrastructure on neighbouring sites are managed.</i></p> <p>And a new policy entirely focussed on Retirement Villages and Provision of Housing for Elderly Persons.</p> <p><i>Throughout all residential zones:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Recognise that the population of Christchurch is ageing and that accommodation and care for the elderly is a critical need across all residential zones.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Enable the development of retirement villages at a greater density that would otherwise apply in the zone while ensuring any adverse effects on infrastructure and neighbouring sites are managed.</i></p> <p>The recommended amendment to Objective 1 as set out above provides sufficient recognition of elderly person housing needs. No further objective is needed.</p> <p>The amended objectives and policies, following technical review provide for provide for retirement villages at 14.1.1.3. However it is recognised that given the importance of providing for such villages that this can be split away from non – household residential accommodation.</p> <p>A new Policy is recommended:</p> <p><u><i>To provide for appropriately designed and located high density</i></u></p>	
--	---	--

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		<p><u>accommodation options and accessory services for older people and those requiring care/assisted living throughout all residential zones.</u></p> <p>and that the non household residential accommodation policy read as:</p> <p><u>Enable sheltered housing, refuges, and student hostels provided the building scale, massing and layout is compatible with the character of any surrounding residential environment.</u></p>	
--	--	--	--

Fencing rules for Residential Suburban Zones			
Too onerous or prescriptive for an existing urban area.	3	A section 32 assessment has been undertaken in relation to the fencing rules. This assessment has determined that the benefits outweigh the costs and that the rules are in accordance with the purpose of the Act	No change.

Vibration at construction time			
That a rule controlling the effects of vibration during construction time is needed.	1	Staff have not investigated a construction vibration rule. It is a matter that could be investigated as part of the remaining residential matters to be addressed in phase 2 of the review.	No change.

Elderly Person Housing units			
Concern / Opposition because provision should be made for Elderly Persons Housing Units	1	<p>The draft Plan makes no provision for Elderly Persons Housing units going forward because ample provision is made for retired persons housing through minor dwelling units, comprehensive housing and retirement villages.</p> <p>See also the discussions under retirement villages.</p>	No change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Minor dwelling units and conversion of 1 residential unit to two.			
Support for minor dwelling units and secondary suites	2	Noted.	No change.
A definition of minor dwelling units is needed.	1	Minor dwelling units are to a degree ‘defined’ by the built form standards – in particular the maximum floor area of 90m ² .	No change.

Detached Minor dwelling units			
Question as to why minor dwelling units need to be ‘detached’.	1	Non detached minor dwelling units are provided for by way of conversion of a residential unit from one into two as a permitted activity. However the comment also suggests that if the house is converted the additional unit will be subject to large developer contributions. This is a matter that needs to be explored in the Annual Plan process as it pertains to developer contributions.	No change.

Landscaping in the Residential suburban zone.			
Concern / opposition because the landscaping requirement are onerous for the Residential Suburban Zone	1	It is recommended the landscaping requirements be confined to comprehensive, social and retirement complexes in the residential suburban zone.	The landscaping requirements be confined to comprehensive, social and retirement complexes in the residential suburban zone –

Minimum floor areas for residential units			
The listed floor areas of 35m ² for studio 45m ² for 1 bedroom 70m ² for 2 bedroom	1	Whilst the developments shown on the website are compelling examples they have not been ‘tested’ for the Christchurch / Canterbury context. They do however represent excellent examples of the type of Minor Dwelling Unit envisaged for the Residential Suburban Zone.	No change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

<p>90m2 for 3 bedroom Are too large and the Hobsonville Point Small Home Test Lab shows smaller floor areas are sustainable. www.axisseries.co.nz/lab/ demonstrates this.</p>			
--	--	--	--

Life Mark and Homestar and Homestar

<p>Concern / opposition because as the population ages 2-3 story buildings Lifemark will not be the best option</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Lifemark should apply to ground floor of new buildings only.</p>	<p>Amendments made to rule to ensure that the Lifemark Standards apply to ground floor of new buildings only.</p>
<p>Concern / opposition – Lifemark - that there is no resource management need <i>for all</i> buildings to provide for because some people see moving house as a natural progression in life and that moving house creates social and economic activity. The policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The provisions do not prevent people from moving house if they do not want to stay where they are.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>A retirement village provider is concerned Lifemark does not suit retirement villages because of the communal style of living. The policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Retirement villages are provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in Residential Zones. Non compliance with the Lifemark Standard is a restricted discretionary activity. Both can be dealt with together in the same resource consent application. Should the applicant be able to show good reason as to why the standard should not apply to Retirement Villages the this can be considered as part of the application. However a change should be made to the associated Life Mark and Homestar assessment matters to acknowledge that the standards may not</p>	<p>Change to Assessment matters to refer to the needs of specialist development.</p>

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		suit a particular specialist development like a retirement village.	
A retirement village providers association is concerned that the Home Star and Life Mark standards would make retirement villages unviable.	1	An assessment of the costs and benefits of the rating standards has been undertaken as part of the Section 32 assessment of the tools. This assessment will be available for their review at the time of public notification of the draft plan. They can review the section 32 and consider their position following public notification. See also the preceding discussion.	No change.
Concern that Life Mark and Homestar should extend to existing homes.	1	Costs and benefits of retrofitting existing homes have not been fully explored, however ‘anecdotally’ the retrofit of existing homes is expensive and it is questionable that it would have sufficient support or justification under Section 32. Further investigation would need to be done to justify retrofit in the City Plan. It is unclear what sort of regulatory mechanism would progress this.	No change.
Concern / opposition – Lifemark and Homestar questions raised as to when details would be required.	2	Details required at building consent stage.	No change.
Support because of an aging population	5	Support noted.	No change.
Support because of provision for extended families.	1	Support noted.	No change.
Support because of provision for people with temporary injuries.	3	Support noted.	No change.
Support because of provision for people with disabilities.	3	Support noted.	No change.
Support because of provision for single people or solo parents	1	Support noted.	No change.
Support because of provision for pregnant women and families with small children.	1	Support noted.	No change.
Support because buildings will be healthier – including a reduction in injuries.	4	Support noted.	No change.
Support because future costs	3	Support noted.	No change.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

to society will be reduced.			
Support because retro fitting is expensive.	2	Support noted.	No change.
Support and would like to see it extended to all Housing New Zealand buildings.	1	Support noted.	No change.
Support – Mechanism will not be onerous to the development community	1	Support noted.	No change.
Support but the implementation of the Homestar tool needs some refinement.	1	<p>The organisation providing the comment are concerned that the internal checking process requires the checking of compliance by the Council of the standards with submission of a Project Information Memorandum at the time of building consent application, but that Project Information Memoranda are no longer compulsory under the Building Act – they question when assessment would be made.</p> <p>However the Council has a statutory responsibility to ensure that when a building consent is issued the consent holder is aware of whether or not a project complies with the City Plan or needs a resource consent. This check is done on a Project Information Memoranda, if one is applied for, or undertaken regardless by resource consent staff. If a non compliance with the City Plan is found then the building consent is issued with a certificate stating a resource consent is required – Section 37 of the Building Act 2004. The certificate must state that until a resource consent is obtained no building work can be undertaken or only undertaken to the extent allowed by the certificate.</p> <p>The building consent holder has the option of providing information or redesigning so that a resource consent is not required.</p> <p>Specifically the section states:</p> <p><i>37 Territorial authority must issue certificate if resource consent required</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1) This section applies if a territorial authority considers that— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (a) a resource consent under the <u>Resource Management Act 1991</u> has not yet been obtained; and • (b) the resource consent will or may materially affect 	Amend the first appendix in Chapter 14 to reflect the PIM and Building Consent checking processes. Add basic Lifemark and Homestar reference material.

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

		<p><i>building work to which a project information memorandum or an application for a building consent relates.</i></p> <p><i>(2) The territorial authority must issue a certificate, in the prescribed form, to the effect that until the resource consent has been obtained—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(a) no building work may proceed; or</i> • <i>(b) building work may only proceed to the extent stated in the certificate.</i> <p><i>(3) The certificate must be—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(a) attached to the project information memorandum; or</i> • <i>(b) if no project information memorandum has been applied for, provided to the building consent authority.</i> <p><u>Emphasis</u> added.</p> <p>Council resource consent and building consent staff will need to be trained in the assessment of the standards. Training can be provided by the respective Homestar and Lifemark organisations.</p> <p>Further detail of process and cost to follow.</p> <p>The organisation acknowledges that the Council needs to reference a specific set of criteria so as to make the tool certain and enforceable. However they are concerned that as the tool is updated the updates will not flow through to implementation in the City Plan.</p> <p>Detail of this discussion will follow.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<i>Travellers Accommodation</i>			
That Bed an Breakfast	1	Bed and Breakfast Accommodation was provided for as part of the	That ‘travellers

SUMMARY OF “FINDING THE BALANCE” PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER

Accommodation be provided for as a permitted activity – as it already is in the City Plan.		<p>definition of residential activity.</p> <p><i>the provision of accommodation to a maximum of four travellers at a tariff where at least one permanent resident resides on the site;</i></p> <p>That has now been brought forward into the activity tables so that it is explicit that it is a permitted activity. A maximum of four appears to be limited and it is recommended the maximum be 6.</p>	accommodation for tariff’ be included in the residential permitted activity tables. And that the maximum number of travellers be 6.
That some limited cooking facilities be allowed in individual rooms for bed and breakfast.	1	It is unclear what limited cooking facilities are and how such a rule would function or be enforced.	No change.

<i>North Halswell Greenfield Development</i>			
Concern / opposition because the land is geotechnically constrained.	1	Full technical assessments have been undertaken in preparation for rezoning. Whilst the land is TC3 the land can be built on subject to remediation / foundation design.	No change.
Concern / opposition because the land is subject to flooding.	4	The land is an identified greenfield growth area in the Regional Policy Statement. Whilst it is currently subject to inundation the subdivision consenting and land remediation processes will ensure that it will not be subject to inappropriate inundation in the future.	No change.
Concern / opposition because of drainage concerns	1	The subdivision consenting and land development processes will ensure that the land can be appropriately drained for stormwater. The land will be developed in accordance with the South West Catchment Management Plan.	No change.
Concern / opposition because of traffic concerns	3	Traffic assessments have been undertaken in preparation for the rezoning. The road layout and timing of works within the development area will ensure that traffic effects are minor.	No change.

<i>Community Housing redevelopment mechanism</i>			
The mechanism should apply to all of Christchurch City Council’s social housing stock.	1	The mechanism was introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan – no investigation has been undertaken into extending it to all Council social housing stock.	No change.

SUMMARY OF "FINDING THE BALANCE" PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT COMMENTS ON THE RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER