

**DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW – RESIDENTIAL CHAPTER 14
SECTION 32 – APPENDIX 4**

**REVIEW OF MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONES AROUND KEY ACTIVITY CENTRES
AND LARGER NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES.**

Prepared by: John Scallan, Christchurch City Council
Date: May, 2014

Contents:

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Stage 1	5
2.1. Strategic Direction.	5
3. Method	6
3.1. Centre identification.	6
3.2. Service and Facilities.	7
3.3. Centre Catchment. Accessibility Analysis	7
3.4. Spatial Analysis for Accessibility	9
3.5. Walking Distance	9
3.6. Boundary Criteria	9
3.7. Site Visits	11
3.8. Activity Centres – Criteria Application Findings	11
3.9. Yield Analysis	14
3.10. Conclusions	16
4. Stage 2	17
5. Method	17
5.1. Criteria	17
5.3 Land Supply and Household Yield from Stage 2	20
5.4 Conclusions	21
Bibliography	22
Attachment 1. Centres of ‘neighbourhood centre’ order or above.	23
Attachment 2. Stage 2. Centre Analysis.	35

1. Executive Summary

The Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) has identified that there will be increased demand for households in Christchurch over the coming years. To meet this demand new homes are to be provided through development of green field subdivisions and through redevelopment in the existing urban area. Capacity exists to meet much of the demand signalled in the LURP, particularly in the short term. However, some increase in supply in the existing urban area is required to ensure that future demand can be met. This will be provided for in part by changes to the District Plan to allow greater housing density in some parts of the city.

The Council, as directed through the LURP, is reviewing the Christchurch City Plan. Through this process the Council is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). The RPS directs the Council to focus intensification (i.e. redevelopment to a greater density of the existing urban area) around, and in support of, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres. This approach is consistent with the consolidation approach to city growth that was established through the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.

The Council has undertaken a two stage exercise to determine where intensification should occur (i.e. identification of appropriate activity centres), and to determine the extent of potential new areas for intensification in these locations. The stages have focused on the following matters:

- Stage 1 – To identify appropriate centres for intensification and the extent of the study area around these centres for the purposes of focusing further analysis and for consultation.
- Stage 2 – To refine the form, extent, and timing for each intensification area taking into account the outcomes of further analysis, existing land supply, consultation responses, known constraints and other planning mechanisms that may be in place.

The process has identified that it is appropriate to enable intensification around nine Key Activity and Large Neighbourhood Centres. An analysis of accessibility to these activity centres (i.e. within 10 minutes walk) identified in excess of 500 hectares of the existing urban area that is accessible to a centre and is therefore potentially appropriate for intensification.

Stage 2 of the process has refined the potential area following further investigation of a range of factors that may influence the potential for successful intensification in each area. Stage 2 also considered the views of the community following consultation on the potential areas. The outcome of Stage 2 was to reduce the potential area for intensification around each centre to arrive at a total of 159 hectares suitable for immediate consideration through the District Plan Review. In addition a further 200 hectares has been identified for investigation as a future source of supply. These are areas around some centres that meet the initial accessibility criteria but for one or a number of reasons may not be suitable for intensification in the immediate future. Any remaining areas identified through Stage 1 that are not included in these two categories are considered suitable to remain as low density residential areas.

The greater proportion of land supply for intensification will be from the existing extent of the medium density zones in the operative Christchurch City Plan (Living 2, Living 3 and Living 4). In addition the new mechanisms inserted into the Christchurch City Plan through the LURP provide additional capacity (two for one, additional unit, the Enhanced Development Mechanism and the Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism). The Central City is also a significant source of housing supply through intensification.

Taking the sources of supply outlined above into account, the potential new areas of intensification identified through this process are considered to provide sufficient additional capacity to meet anticipated household demand through intensification. Furthermore, the distribution of new areas of intensification around the nine centres will also help to support the continued viability of these centres as a focal point for the community and provide a range of housing choices in a range of locations across the City.

2. Stage 1

Identification of Potential Locations for Intensification.

The focus for identification of new locations for intensification is drawn from the strategic direction established through the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) and implemented through Regional Policy Statement (RPS). This directs the Council to focus intensification on activity centres. The Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) supports this direction for the purposes of the meeting household demand and supporting centres in the recovery period (until 2028).

2.1. Strategic Direction.

The UDS established the strategic direction for accommodating population growth and the subsequent growth in households in the Greater Christchurch area. Demand for new homes arising from population growth is to be met through a combination of new subdivisions and intensification within the existing urban area. The proportion of household supply achieved through intensification is to increase overtime. Intensification becomes the primary source of new household supply in the latter period of the UDS (after 2027) but overall the supply of homes through new Greenfield and intensification is balanced across the UDS period. The changes to the Regional Policy Statement made through the LURP are generally consistent with direction of the UDS, albeit with a focus on recovery and changes to household demand in the post-earthquake environment. There is a greater emphasis on Greenfield growth in the short-medium term (until 2028).

The relevant objectives and policies of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement direct the Council to look at particular areas of the city and identify where in these areas medium density development may be appropriate. In summary:

Objective 6.2.2 – Urban form and settlement, directs the council to provide sufficient land for rebuilding and recovery and set the foundation for future growth. Paragraph (1) provides targets for intensification and Paragraph (2) states that this shall occur in and around the Central City, Key Activity Centres, and larger neighbourhood centres.

Objective 6.2.5 – Key activity and other centres, seeks to support and maintain the existing network of activity centres through the recovery period. The explanation for this is that a Key Activity Centre will support the intensification of residential activity within the surrounding area, noting further that inappropriate development outside of Key Activity Centres will undermine the community's investment in existing centres. The different scale and function of the centres is noted as a determinate of the extent of residential intensification.

Objective 6.2.4 – integration of transport infrastructure and land use, seeks to prioritise the planning of transport infrastructure to maximise integration with priority areas. The objective is to reduce dependency of private motor vehicles, promoting the use of active and public transport modes, and optimising the use of the existing transport network. While this objective is not explicit about the connection with intensification it is logical to draw the conclusion that intensification around Key Activity Centres will make a significant contribution to achieving the stated outcomes of the objective.

Having established the reasoning for the overall approach through the objectives, the relevant policies of the RPS provide the specific direction to the Council:

Policy 6.3.4 – Transport effectiveness directs the Council to include objectives and policies within the District Plan to ensure that development provides for and supports the uptake of active and public transport.

Policy 6.3.7 – Residential location, yield and intensification, Paragraph (2), directs that intensification shall be focused around the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres commensurate with their scale and function¹. The Council is required to identify areas that are suitable for urban intensification. The Policy also states that in order to support a sustainable urban form; intensification is ideally located around the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres.

The Central City has a significant role in meeting the overall demand for new homes through intensification. Land zoning appropriate for intensification already exists within the Central City and in the residential suburbs that border it.

3. Method

3.1. Centre identification.

The first step in meeting the general direction established through the objectives and policies of the RPS has been to assess all centres that fall into the two categories of Key Activity Centre and Neighbourhood Centre. The purpose was to identify those centres which have an appropriate scale and function to support intensification. In addition, this stage also sought to identify any reasons specific to a centre that would exclude it from consideration for intensification as part of this District Plan Review.

Infrastructure capacity constraints that affect a whole centre were considered at this stage. Infrastructure constraints are not necessarily sufficient reason to exclude a centre completely, as they are often in the process of being resolved. Some limited intensification, assessed in a local scale, may be accommodated in the short-term.

Attachment 1 provides a list of Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres that were considered at this stage. The list of centres includes all those that have been identified as neighbourhood centre or above from the hierarchy of centres in the draft Commercial Chapter of the District Plan Review. This includes centres that are zoned presently as Business 2 (in whole or in part) in the operative Christchurch City Plan. Attachment 1 provides the specific reasons for including or excluding each centre for progression to further analysis in Stage 2.

The following centres have been identified as having the range of facilities and services suitable for supporting a degree of intensification of the residential area that surrounds each centre:

Key Activity Centres:

Barrington;
Hornby;
Linwood;
Papanui;

¹ Policy 6.3.7. Also directs intensification to core public transport routes. These areas have not been considered other than where there is an overlap of spatial criteria around KACs and LNCs. The reasons for this are outlined on the Strategic Directions chapter of the District Plan Review.

Riccarton;
Shirley.

Large Neighbourhood Centres:

Bishopdale;
Church Corner;
Merivale.

These activity centres provide a scope and range of activities, businesses and services that are sufficient to meet most of the everyday needs of the local population. Three Key Activity Centres identified in the LURP have been excluded, namely New Brighton, Belfast and Halswell.

New Brighton was excluded from consideration due to the existing provision for medium and high density residential development in the area. There is also a degree of uncertainty around the risk to the New Brighton neighbourhood associated with sea level rise and tsunami inundation.

Belfast was excluded due to the prevalence of newer residential development in the area (which includes a component of medium density). The bulk of the housing stock close to Belfast was constructed relatively recently and as a result there are likely to be few viable redevelopment opportunities in the immediate future. In addition the Belfast Key Activity Centre will serve a number of future residential greenfield development areas in the vicinity of the centre. A medium density component will be a feature of some of these areas.

The location of the Key Activity Centre for Halswell is to be a new activity centre to be established on Sparks Road. This will be developed as part of a greenfield subdivision (that is being implemented as part of the District Plan Review). The extensive residential greenfield subdivisions around the new centre will include a medium density component. For these reasons the Halswell KAC was excluded from consideration in Stage 1.

3.2. Service and Facilities.

Activity centres should provide a wide range of facilities and services to support the daily needs of the local residents. As a minimum the centre should have a large supermarket, a general store (or range of small shops that fulfil this role) and good mix of other shops, facilities and services. Activity centres need not address all the requirements of local residents but there should be sufficient provision to enable the residents to meet their everyday needs on a local basis, should they choose to.

Table 1 summarises the range of services and facilities available at the nine activity centres identified for further investigation in Stage 1.

3.3. Centre Catchment. Accessibility Analysis

A location suitable for medium density housing should have reasonable access to one of the activity centre. New areas of medium density should be reasonably accessible to:

1. An activity centre of a size and diversity that provides a wide range of facilities and services; and in addition also be accessible to:
2. Public transport; and,
3. Open Space.

To guide the initial extent of the Residential Medium Density zone an approximate 400 meter radius or 800 meters walking distance following the existing street network from each activity centre was used. A distance of 800 meters is approximately a 10 minute walk. Depending on the purpose of the trip, these distances are generally accepted as the upper limits of the distance / time impedance above which most people may prefer not to walk to reach their destination².

Table 1 Activity Centres Facilities and Services

Centre	Supermarket	General Merchandise	Library	Health Services	Bank	Specialist Shops	Cinema	Post Office	Restaurants and Bars	Recreation and Sport	Community Activity	Professional Services	PT Interchange
Barrington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hornby	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Linwood	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Papanui	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Riccarton	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Shirley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bishopdale	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Church Cnr.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Merivale	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N

For the activity centre itself, a walking time of 10 minutes may be considered a reasonable walking distance³. For Open Space, depending on the purpose of the trip, a journey time of five minutes is more appropriate. Although for some recreation activities a longer journey may be acceptable. Public transport should also be accessible within a 10 minutes walk. These limits on walking distance catchments will only be relevant to those households at the edge of any catchment. Most households within a catchment determined using these assumptions will actually be closer than a five or ten minute walk.

All of the activity centres being considered have a number of bus routes that connect with or through the centre. All the centres are served by at least one Core Bus Route⁴. Most of the centres are additionally identified as public transport interchange points (Hornby, Riccarton, Papanui, Barrington, Shirley and Linwood). These are points on the network where a number of bus routes (including the Core Bus Routes) converge in a coordinated manner to connect services for onward journeys. Consequently these centres offer a high degree of accessibility to the bus network.

Compared to typical lower density development, there is less provision of private open space in medium density housing. There is a need to ensure that people living in medium density developments have access to areas of public open space near to their homes. The provision of open space is a critical component of place making, enabling medium density areas to become areas of high amenity and attractive places to live. Intensification in an area will place more emphasis on the importance of existing open space, potentially helping to enhance and regenerate underutilised spaces.

Open space can take the form of pocket parks, recreational parks or other categories of public open space. Open space (ideally within a five minutes walk) is more likely to compensate for a smaller provision of private open space that is associated with medium density housing. Identifying areas for

² Residential Intensification, Abley Transport Engineers for Christchurch City Council, 2009 and Land Transport New Zealand Research Report 353, 2008.

³ See Environment Court Decision No:[2013] NZEnvc 159, ENV-2010-WLG-000127, 16 July 2013.

⁴ Regional Public Transport Plan 2012, Environment Canterbury.

intensification can also help to focus the need for future investment in and provision of open space in an area.

3.4. Spatial Analysis for Accessibility

A walking distance analysis using the street network around each centre was undertaken to guide the appropriate extent for the RMD zone. Two main outcomes were sought from this exercise: Firstly, it has been used to guide to the potential extent of the RMD zone, for the purposes of consultation. Secondly, it has helped to identify where there are areas that have acceptable access to a centre but are less accessible to public open space. Further boundary criteria were applied to refine the analysis-derived extent in order to account for logical boundaries that may exist in each area.

3.5. Walking Distance

For each centre the distance from the edge of the centre boundary was measured using the existing pattern of streets to represent the walking network. For the purposes of analysis, a centre comprises existing Business 1 and Business 2 zoned land, including associated land zoned for parking (Business 2P). A distance of 800 meters was used as an approximate for a 10 minute walk.

Some of the centres are linear in form. This has the effect of significantly increasing the walking distance for residents should they wish to access a service located at the far end of the centre relative to their point of origin. To account for this in the analysis would require detailed knowledge of individual trip purpose. It would, in any case, represent only a snap shot in time unsuited to the generality of the analysis at this stage. A general measure of accessibility has therefore been adopted and for this it has been assumed that an individual has reached a centre once they have crossed the boundary of it, regardless of their intended destination once within the centre.

The analysis has also taken pedestrian only routes into consideration. These can be paved or non-formal pathways across parks and pedestrian routes between buildings or across legally stopped roads. The conclusions regarding accessibility to the centres take any publically accessible pedestrian routes into account. Street crossing points and signalised crossing times have not been incorporated in the analysis. This level of detail was considered beyond what was required for the generality of the analysis for at this stage (i.e. to inform further work).

Finally it is essential to note that in considering the output of the spatial analysis it should be with regard to the purpose for which it has been used. That is to say, it has been a guide for further investigation to delineate a potential RMD zone boundary, rather than the sole mechanism by which potential zone boundaries have been established.

3.6. Boundary Criteria

The broad potential extent of the medium density area around each of the identified centres was established through analysis of the walking network. The boundaries of the potential RMD zone were refined to take into account land use around each centre. This stage of analysis has considered the following:

Clear Boundaries.

Where possible it is preferable to use clear physical boundaries to define a residential medium density zone boundary. Examples of appropriate boundaries may include: Open Space, a transition to industrial

or Business use, larger roads, landscape feature such as water ways or other non-residential zone boundaries.

Mid-block vs. local street boundaries.

Mid-block boundaries may be preferable to local road boundaries in some instances. A zone boundary along a local road can result in an inconsistent streetscape on either side of the road as one side is developed to a different density than the other. The use of the clear physical boundaries is an approach most likely to avoid this, but where this is not possible mid-block boundaries may need to be considered. A change in zoning on a plot boundary ensures that at that boundary the rules of the lower density zone apply, therefore the impact on the lower density zone dwellings is as if the adjoining zone was the same.

Road boundaries on local streets may be more appropriate where there are particular features of the road or built form that would less readily support medium density on one side of the road while it is not appropriate on the other. Major roads that are wider and carry more traffic are more suitable as zone boundaries. In most cases road boundaries can provide certainty to the extent of different zones. Most of the boundaries for the existing Living 3 zone follow roads.

There is a proposed restriction on height to eight meters in any areas of RMD zone where the transition is from Living 1 or Living 2. This restriction reduces the potential for inconsistency between sides of a street. The operative Living 1 and Living 2 zones allow development to eight meters in height so it is possible for both medium density and lower density urban forms on opposite sides of a street to produce a relatively balanced street environment.

Special Amenity Areas.

These areas have been identified as having unique and special values within the urban environment. These values may be threatened by an increase in density within the area. For this reason the Special Amenity areas (SAMs) have been excluded from the potential RMD zone. The review of the SAM areas in Phase 2 of the District Plan Review will consider the impact of a change in zone on SAM areas.

Cul-de-sacs and rear sections.

Cul-de-sacs in the existing urban area are often the result of infill of mid-block sections. As a consequence the section size and shape may be different from that of the surrounding residential area, and the houses are likely to be newer than houses found at the edge of a block. It is not unusual to find a cul-de-sac development with houses that are a number of decades younger than neighbouring houses.

Land parcels around cul-de-sacs tend to be narrower at the entrance to the parcel. This pattern of boundaries is less ideal than regular shaped sections for the development of town houses. For example, with a narrow street entrance it is not possible to align medium density development with primary outlook to the street. This potentially creates more overlooking and privacy issues for neighbouring properties than would otherwise be the case. Furthermore, narrow street frontages and tight turning circles of cul-de-sacs reduce the space for on-street parking in cul-de-sac developments. If redeveloped this problem may be more apparent with increased demand for parking. Parcel amalgamation to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment of larger sites can help to mitigate these problems.

Avoidance of Reverse Sensitivity

Residential areas located close to industrial activity (Business 5 zones in the operative District Plan) are avoided in order to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity issues. For this criterion a 200 meter exclusion buffer was applied around areas of Business 5 zoned land (as they are found in the operative Plan).

3.7. Site Visits

As part of the assessment process a series of site visits to each of the centres was undertaken. The aim of the site visits was to 'ground truth' the boundary arrived at through spatial analysis against the criteria outlined above and provide an general indication of built form, patterns of development and potential for change within the potential RMD zone. Site visits were also used to confirm accessibility to the centre from the surrounding residential area, including confirming the use of access pathways that are not part of the formal street network (e.g. park footpaths and alleyways). The information gathered from the site visits helped to inform Stage 2 of the process.

3.8. Activity Centres – Criteria Application Findings

The core criteria were applied to each centre. A summary of the findings from this process is provided in this section. All the nine centres assessed are located on core bus routes and are served by a number of bus services. All have bus stops located within the centre. Furthermore, the six Key Activity Centres are identified as interchange points on the bus network. For these reasons the analysis of access to the centre itself was also considered to address access to public transport. The extent of the potential medium density area around was indicated on the draft planning maps issued for consultation in early 2014.

Centre: Linwood

Eastgate Mall and the large format retail space constitute the bulk of commercial activity in the area. The centre also has a strong service component with medical, banking and legal services all present.

Centre accessibility analysis: The centre is on the intersection of Linwood Avenue and Buckleys Road. These are busy major arterial roads but with signalled pedestrian crossing points close to the centre. There are otherwise no significant barriers to pedestrian access in the vicinity of the centre. The analysis of the street network based on an 800 meter walking distance from the centre reveals a greater degree of access to the west and north-west. This is as a result of the street orientation being towards the centre. To the east the streets are at right angles to the centre, resulting in a more confined area of accessibility. Linwood Park and the adjacent Linwood Avenue School are barriers to vehicle access. There are a number of pedestrian routes across the park that link the streets to the south of the park through to the KAC.

Open Space: Linwood Park is the largest area of public Open Space. Situated to the south of the Eastgate Mall this park has a number of sports fields and other facilities. Part of the park is currently being used as temporary housing. The other large parks in the area are Bromley Park and the North Linwood Community Park. Both of these are to the north of Eastgate Mall. Most of the Linwood KAC catchment has reasonable access to public Open Space. However, the collection of streets between Eastgate Mall and the (former) Linwood Intermediate site is less accessible to open space. This is in part due to the lack of pedestrian access to the southern corner of North Linwood Community Park but also due to a general lack of public Open Space in this part of the catchment. A contributing factor is also a general lack of Open Space 1 zone pocket parks in the area.

Centre: Merivale

Merivale Mall is at the centre of a commercial area that stretches along the section of Papanui Road through Merivale. This centre merges into the St Georges Hospital complex to the north.

Centre accessibility analysis: The linear nature of the centre along Papanui Road and the lack of barriers to access results in a uniform catchment pattern that extends from Papanui Road along local roads. Although a busy road, Papanui Road has a number of signalised pedestrian crossing points.

Open Space: There is little provision of public Open Space within the walking catchment for the centre. What there is is limited to a small pocket park on Papanui Road. However, in close proximity to the edge of the catchment there are three parks: Malvern, Elmwood and Abberley. Areas to the east of Papanui Road have better access to open space than those to the west. In particular the area to the south-west of the centre has poorer access to open space.

Centre: Barrington

The Barrington Mall complex comprises most of the Barrington KAC with other Business 2 zoned land in close proximity occupied by a variety of smaller commercial units. Spreydon library is located within the centre, between the mall car park and Barrington Park.

Centre accessibility analysis: The street network around the centre is grid-like with regular intersections. The only real barrier to access in the vicinity of the centre is as a result of long urban blocks but there are a number of mid-block pedestrian pathways that provide access through these. A network coverage analysis based on an 800 meter walking distance from the centre reveals a fairly extensive and uniform coverage, consistent with the street pattern.

Open Space: Barrington Park (an Open Space 2 zoned, recreational reserve) constitutes the main provision of public open space in the area. It features a children's play area, a number of sports pitches and tennis courts. Centrally located adjacent to the Barrington Mall, Barrington Park is accessible to most of the same catchment as the KAC is. Due to a large urban block to the south of the Park the streets at the southern periphery of the KAC catchment are less accessible to the Park. To the south-east of the KAC is Somerfield Park. This is Open Space 2 zoned land adjacent to Sydenham cemetery. There is a pedestrian link between Roker Street and the park which improves access to the Somerfield Park from the north-west.

Centre: Papanui

A linear block of Business 1 and Business 2 zones comprise the commercial area of Papanui. These zones are spread along an approximately one kilometre stretch of Papanui Road and Main North Road. The Northlands Mall complex dominates the northern half of the centre.

Centre accessibility analysis: As a consequence of the linear nature of the centre the catchment extends far to the north and south. The main north rail line presents a significant physical barrier to access for the centre; however there are four roads which cross the rail line which afford a degree of permeability for all transport modes. There is an area of Business 5 zoned land to the west of Northlands Mall. The application of the 200 meter buffer around Business 5 zoned land reduces considerably the potential RMD area, particularly to the west of the railway line.

Open Space: The largest area of open space in the area is Saint James Park. This is an Open Space 2 recreational reserve and has a number of sports fields. Part of the park is used for lawn bowls. Papanui Domain is to the north west of Northwood Mall. This is also a recreation park. Papanui Domain is adjacent to the grounds of Papanui High School, so creating a much larger open space, albeit only partly on public land. Smaller areas of open space can be found at Papanui Stream Esplanade and Shearer Playground. Overall the distribution of open space around the centre ensures that most areas have good access to an area of open space.

Centre: Riccarton

The focus of activity in the Riccarton KAC is along Riccarton Road, comprising the Business 1 and 2 zoned land either side of the road and the Westfield Mall complex of buildings.

Centre accessibility analysis: The catchment around the KAC is fairly compact. This is due to the location of Riccarton Bush to the north and two large Special Amenity areas at the western end of the centre's catchment. Together these form a logical boundary to the potential RMD zone. There is already an extensive area to the south and east of the centre that is zoned Living 3 under the operative Plan. Therefore, the new areas of potential intensification are focused on the area to the north of the Business 1 zone and to the west of Westfield Mall.

Open Space: Riccarton Bush is the largest area of Open Space within the catchment of the centre. In addition there are a number of smaller pocket parks close to the centre. Hagley Park lies to the east of the centre and is a readily accessible, particularly for those residential streets to the east and north-east of the centre.

Centre: Church Corner

The focus of activity in the Church Corner KAC is along Riccarton Road and the Bush Inn Shopping Centre. This comprises the Business 1 and 2 zoned land either side of the road. The residential area to the west of Waimairi Road is zoned Living 2 and a significant degree of subdivision has taken place. To the north of the area there is significant medium density development that provides student accommodation. Close to the Bush Inn Shopping Centre there are also a number of examples of medium density development.

Centre accessibility analysis: The catchment around the KAC is fairly broad, stretching to the southern boundary of the University of Canterbury site.

Open Space: Auburn Reserve and the smaller Hansons Reserve are the only areas of public open space within the catchment of the centre. To the north, the grounds of the university provide a large area of private but accessible open space (particularly given that the students constitute a significant proportion of the residential population of the area)

Centre: Bishopdale

The centre is compact and focused on the Bishopdale Mall.

Centre accessibility analysis: The concentrated nature of the centre and the lack of barriers to access results in a uniform catchment pattern that extends an approximately equal distance in all directions with some variations due to road layouts.

Open Space: There are two main areas of open space: Bishopdale Park and Grant Armstrong Park. These are located close to the centre. Elsewhere there is a wide distribution of pocket parks, the result being that most of the area has reasonable access to public open space.

Centre: Hornby

The commercial area of Hornby is focused on the land around the intersection of Main South Road and Carmen Road / Shands Road.

Centre accessibility analysis: Streets to the south of the centre are orientated towards the centre which improves access along the street network. To the west and north-west Denton and Kyle Parks restrict access to walking and cycling only. The railway lines are barrier to access but both road and pedestrian routes cross it at regular intervals. All the major roads through the centre are busy arterials which do present a barrier to walking access, both in terms of limiting direct access and in creating a poorer environment for walking.

Open Space: Denton Park and Kyle Park provide the main areas of open space for the centre. These are very accessible to areas to the north and north east but less so from areas to the south (which necessitates crossing Main South Road). There are fewer large areas of open space to the south that are close to the centre, there are however a number of small pocket parks and reserves.

Centre: Shirley

The focus for Shirley is in and around the Palms shopping centre with some commercial and community activity located on the west side of Marshlands Road.

Centre accessibility analysis: There are no significant barriers to access present around the Shirley area although Marshlands Road does restrict the direct access from the west. To the east the Shirley Golf Course and Burwood Park limits the extent of a potential zone. To the south the grounds of the Shirley Intermediate and Shirley Boys High School serves a similar function. As a result, the potential area for the RMD zone extends further to the north and north-west of the centre.

Open Space: There is one small Open Space zoned area within the KAC catchment. Beyond this there are two large areas of Open Space 2 zoned land; Macfarlane Park the north-west and Burwood Park to the east. Both of these parks serve both a recreational and sports field function. There is an abundance of private open space close to the centre including the Shirley golf course and the grounds and playing fields of Hammersley School, Shirley Intermediate School and Shirley Boys High School. This gives the impression of a plentiful supply of open space in the area, but noting that this is not publically accessible.

3.9. Yield Analysis

Land Area. The potential area that meets the basic criteria for accessibility for the RMD zone around the nine centres covers a total of 522 hectares. This area is the sum of the residential land and excludes road space, parks and land zoned for other uses. It does include any land zoned for residential use but that is currently used for non-residential activity. The extent of the area identified is significant, comparable to the total land area that is already zoned for Living 3 in the operative Plan (a total of 537 hectares).

Households. The LURP sets a target for intensification of 5,422 households in the 2016-2026 period and 8,635 households for the 2021-2028 period⁵. Of the 522 hectares of residential land identified in stage 1, 371 hectares is presently zoned as Living 1 and 280 hectares as Living 2. In total the area contains 8,873 household units.

At the minimum density for the new RMD zone (30 households per hectare), 522 hectares could theoretically yield a total of 15,660 residential units (based on the actual zoned area, net of roads but taking into account no other factors that might otherwise limit development potential). This is a net theoretical yield of 6,787 residential units. Thirty households per hectare is the minimum required for medium density developments and is at the lower end of the medium density range.

Typically single storey town house style developments can readily achieve 30 households per hectare (i.e. a single dwelling on a 330 square meter plot). The yield for individual developments can be far higher than 30 households per hectare. This will depend on the interaction of the variables that may apply to the building plot, housing typology, design approach and house size. For example, a yield of 60 households per hectare is achievable in a development consisting of mainly smaller units (i.e. one and two bedroom). There are many other variations in design and typologies that can deliver a range of densities between 30 and 60 plus households per hectare within the draft rules of the RMD zone. A study of housing typologies produced for the Council in 2009 indicated that good urban design outcomes are possible at a range of densities above 30 households per hectare⁶. Two storey developments that have good urban design outcomes and utilise some degree of site amalgamation can realistically expect to yield in the region of 40 households per hectare. There are many examples of developments in the existing Living 3 zone that have delivered in excess of 60 households per hectare on larger sites or where site amalgamation has been possible.

The operative Living 3 zone covers 537 hectares. Taking into account only the total area, the theoretical yield is approximately 16,000 households at 30 households per hectare and 32,000 at 60 households per hectare. There are currently just over 15,000 household units within the existing Living 3 zone indicating that the full potential of the zone is not fully realised. The pattern of intensification does vary considerably across the city. In some areas the uptake of intensification has been fairly extensive (for example, in St Albans), while in other areas only sporadic intensification can be found (for example, parts of Linwood and parts of Spreydon). Some areas have recently (in the last two to three years) experienced a more rapid change towards medium density (e.g. Addington). Where medium density development has occurred, the yield tends to be upwards of 30 households per hectare. The current average density in the Living 3 zone is just under 30 households per hectare which indicates that there is a significant potential supply within Living 3.

The existing Living 2 zone extends over 696 hectares of the City. The built outcome intended for the Living 2 zone is for a low to medium density form, a higher density than in generally found in Living 1 but not as dense as Living 3. However, the upper end of the density achievable in Living 2 is 30 households per hectare and there are many examples of developments in the Living 2 zone that attain this density. As with the Living 3 zone, considerable spare capacity for growth exists in the Living 2 zone. Development to the full allowance of the zone is sporadic and highly variable across the city. In some Living 2 zoned suburbs, developments that have achieved a density of 30 households per hectare are

⁵ The period 2013-2016 has a target for intensification of 6,685 household units. It is anticipated that this will be achieved through ongoing infill and intensification in existing Living zones as well as through the other mechanisms inserted into the District Plan through LURP (Enhanced Development Mechanism, Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism and the other interventions to assist with immediate requirements for additional housing.) The focus for the intensification around centres is on contributing to the supply in the periods after 2016.

⁶ See 'Exploring new housing choices for changing lifestyles', Jasmax, Christchurch City Council. 2009.

common (e.g. parts of Merivale), elsewhere less so (e.g. Barrington). Based on the extent of the zoned area alone, the operative Living 2 zone could theoretically accommodate approximately 7,000 households (net) over and above what the zone currently accommodates.

Theoretical assessments do not take into account all the building and planning factors that affect the potential for medium density development, or the speed at which change may occur. A more realistic approach to predicting the uptake of intensification needs to take into account a number of variables. This will include plot ratio and minimum lot size (which affects yield when dependent on original lot size), building age, single vs. multiple-ownership, land value, and planning constraints (specific zone restrictions, the presence of protected trees or buildings). Site amalgamation is also a significant factor in determining yield. In addition to allowing more flexibility for urban design outcomes, the amalgamation of sites reduces the impact of boundary constraints on a development, effectively internalising effects that might otherwise have to be avoided or mitigated. Overall, the capacity for intensification within the existing Living 2 and Living 3 zones is less than the theoretical maximum⁷ but is still the most significant source of potential intensification supply.

3.10. Conclusions

1. Stage 1 has identified centres considered suitable to support residential intensification. An analysis of accessibility to these centres has identified an area around each centre that may be suitable for intensification.
2. Taking into account the potential capacity within existing Living 2 and Living 3 zoned areas, the total extent of the potential Residential Medium Density zone identified in Stage 1 is in excess of the land area required to meet the anticipated demand for intensification, particularly in the 2016-2021 period. This is a further consideration for Stage 2.

⁷ Strategic Intensification Review Issue Paper. Household Capacity within Living 2 and Living 3 under the City Plan Provisions. March 2009 (draft). Christchurch City Council.

4. Stage 2

4.1. Refinement of focus areas for intensification.

Stage 2 of the assessment process has involved a further detailed examination of the potential areas for intensification around each centre. The focus was to determine if the areas identified in Stage 1 are appropriate from the perspective of land supply, distribution, access, community opinion and a range of other factors. This stage takes also into account constraints that may exist on infrastructure capacity; any confluence with other medium density enabling planning mechanisms that may apply (namely the Enhanced Development Mechanism and the Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism); further analysis of development potential; and existing characteristics and patterns of development.

5. Method

Stage 2 was primarily a desktop planning exercise. Additional site visits were undertaken where appropriate. For each of the nine centres a number of criteria were examined. For most centres the revision to the extent of the RMD zone is based upon an interaction of influences derived from the application of the criteria.

5.1. Criteria

Stage 2 analysis has considered the following:

1. Potential for Change.

An agglomeration of a number of drivers, the potential for change around a centre has been considered. Where parts of the potential extent of the RMD zone have been identified as unlikely to change, consideration has been given to excluding these areas from the zone. For example, building age is a useful indicator of the potential of an area to change following an alteration to the zone. A predominance of older housing stock situated on larger sections is generally more conducive to medium density development and site amalgamation in particular. Conversely, a mix of building age in an area can be an indicator that change in an area is already happening, particularly where older houses have been replaced by multiple newer units.

A congregation of recent intensification type developments can indicate that there may be a greater acceptance of medium density housing development in an area. However, where significant change has already occurred under existing planning rules it can also indicate limited further capacity or that the existing zone (Living 2, where applicable) is an effective zone for delivering medium density in an area. In these areas the potential for change may be less and opportunities for site amalgamation leading to comprehensive development can be reduced. Depending on the degree and type of change, some areas may be more suitable for transition to the RMD zone relative to other areas.

2. Existing Medium Density Development Mechanisms.

The LURP inserted into the operative District Plan two mechanisms for achieving comprehensive medium density developments. The first of these, the Enhanced Development Mechanism (EDM), allows comprehensively planned medium density development to a minimum of 30 households per hectare to occur in areas of the city that meet certain location and zone criteria. In some centres there is strong correlation between the potential extent of the RMD zone and the potential applicability of the EDM. In

these areas, or parts of these areas, there may be a legitimate need to reduce the extent of the RMD on the basis that there is a planning mechanism already in place that can provide for intensification. This is relevant in areas where there is an infrastructure constraint. In the areas where this applies, consideration has been given to the extent that the demand arising from the EDM and potential RMD zone may be in excess of current local infrastructure capacity, or where the infrastructure constraint may need to be assessed on an application basis (which is possible with the EDM). Where such constraints do not exist consideration has been given to the way the RMD zone may be complementary to the use of the EDM. This is particularly relevant where the EDM may have a sporadic application.

The areas identified for the CHRM do not correlate closely with areas around centres. However, where there is an association in a wider spatial context this has also been considered (e.g. infrastructure catchment or the overall potential land supply for intensification near to a centre).

Both the EDM and CHRM are limited initially to a five year period of operation (i.e. until December 2018), subject to a review prior to the end of this period. This has also been taken into account.

3. Infrastructure Capacity.

Intensification areas need to have sufficient capacity in existing infrastructure networks to accommodate an increase in household numbers. Over time most capacity constraints for infrastructure can be resolved, while others can be addressed through the rules around residential development form and need not prevent intensification in principle. The extent of the RMD zone needs to reflect if there are known impediments to development at this time.

4. Housing Supply and Distribution.

Analysis of the theoretical yield of the potential RMD zoned areas around centres has revealed a probable over-supply of land for intensification. Around some centres in particular the extent of the potential RMD zone was extensive due to an absence of boundary criteria that limited the extent of the RMD zone around other centres identified in stage 1. There exists, therefore, scope to reduce the extent of the RMD zone around some centres without adversely affecting the overall land supply for intensification, and while achieving a distribution of capacity between centres.

5. Accessibility.

Where scope has been identified to reduce the RMD area around a centre there has been a greater focus on concentrating the remaining RMD zone to locations that have the best access to the centre, public transport and to public Open Space. This is more likely to ensure that the built form for intensification remains consistent to the overall direction. Where open space is less accessible this need not be a reason for excluding an area. The change in zoning can signal the need to investigate options for increasing the supply of open in a particular area. This criterion also considers if there are any significant physical barriers to access to a centre that may make particular areas less accessible and therefore less suitable for intensification.

6. Community Opinion.

The pre-notification consultation process has received comments from residents of the proposed RMD zoned areas directly affected by the change. Consultation is a source of information on localised issues around character, access, infrastructure capacity and ongoing change. Taken together with other

factors, consultation responses can help to determine what may be the most appropriate areas for change around each centre.

5.2. Assessment by Centre

The Stage 2 criteria were applied to each of the nine centres. For the majority of centres the total area of the potential RMD zone has been reduced. For some centres the potential RMD zone has, in part or in whole, been deferred for consideration at a future point in time. These areas are considered to meet the accessibility criteria in general but for a variety of reasons are not suitable for an immediate change to allow medium density through a permanent change to the RMD zone. These areas will be assessed through a separate process at an appropriate point in the future.

A brief summary of the change resulting from the Stage 2 analysis is provided here. The details of the analysis for each centre are provided in Attachment 2. For the purposes of clarity the outcome of the Stage 1 is referred to as 'Stage 1 RMD zone' and the revised zone is referred to as 'Stage 2 RMD zone' as is appropriate.

Table 3. Summary of change to the extent of the RMD zone.

Centre	Change to extent of proposed (Stage 1) RMD zone:
Barrington	Waste Water infrastructure capacity is constrained so the EDM is considered an appropriate mechanism for the supply of medium density housing in the short to medium term. Through the EDM infrastructure capacity is considered on a site-by-site basis. The area around Barrington will need to be reconsidered upon the expiry of the EDM mechanism,
Bishopdale	The proposed extent of the RMD zone is significantly reduced to focus on the residential blocks closest to the centre.
Church Corner	The EDM will allow for some medium density development around the centre in the operative Living 2 zone on a site by site basis. Waste Water infrastructure capacity is constrained so the EDM is considered an appropriate mechanism for supply of medium density housing in the short term as infrastructure capacity can be considered on a site-by-site basis, until such time as capacity ceases to be a general constraint around the centre. The area around Church Corner will need to be reconsidered upon the expiry of the EDM mechanism,
Hornby	The area of the Stage 1 RMD zone to the south east is removed. The RMD zone is reduced to cover areas with the greatest accessibility to the KAC.
Linwood	No RMD zone is proposed for Linwood with the exception of a small number of lots on the west edge of Linwood Park. The RSDT zone is to be expanded to include existing Living 1 zoned land to the east of the centre.
Merivale	In acknowledgment of the exiting medium density development around the centre, the extent of the RMD zone is reduced to focus on the urban blocks closest to the centre. A waste water infrastructure constraint exists in the area but allows for some modest provision for intensification. Given the exiting density in the area, the theoretical increase in households that will be achievable through the RMD zone is considered appropriate for the infrastructure capacity that is available.
Papanui	The extent of the RMD zone is significantly reduced to align with the extent of the existing Living 2 zoned area and in addition two urban blocks closest to the northern end of the KAC. The area to the west of the railway line was removed from consideration.

Riccarton	The extent of the potential RMD zone is reduced to cover a small area to the west of the centre that adjoins the existing Living 3 zone. This area is not constrained by waste water infrastructure capacity. For much of the remainder of the area waste water capacity analysis indicates a constraint to development. Areas furthest from the centre are recommended to transition to residential suburban.
Shirley	The extent of the RMD zone is reduced to urban blocks closest to the KAC. This was done to acknowledge the potential housing supply achievable through the CHRMA area that is close to the centre.

5.3 Land Supply and Household Yield from Stage 2

The extent of the potential RMD zone derived from the Stage 2 assessment is significantly reduced from the potential area identified in Stage 1. The Stage 2 analysis has identified 159 hectares (net of roading) as most appropriate for transition to the RMD zone. This was reduced to 137 hectares (net) with the removal of the area around Linwood and the changes to the area around Merivale. The total extent of the RMD zone is approximately 170 hectares including land not in residential use (e.g. roads). Further areas were identified as appropriate for investigation at a future point in time (predominantly the areas covered by the EDM as part of the review required for the provision, but also for additional areas around centres where it may be appropriate for meeting demand in the later part of the UDS period). The remaining areas identified in Stage 1 are considered appropriate to transition to Residential Suburban.

The theoretical yield (based on the zoned area alone) for 135 hectares is approximately 3000 units at 40 Household per hectare (net, after subtracting existing units). This rises to over 5700 units at 60 Households per hectare. Table 4 provides the details of the distribution of supply between centres and existing operative Living zones. For comparison Table 5 shows the same calculation applied to existing Living 2 and 3 zones.

Table 4

Living 1 transition to RMD

Centre name	Hectares L1	Existing Households	Existing Density (h/ha)	Theoretical RMD Yield (@30 h/ha)	Theoretical RMD Yield (@40 h/ha)	Net theoretical RMD Yield (@40 h/ha)
Bishopdale	30.7	496	16	921	1228	732
Hornby	8.65	137	16	259	346	209
Merivale	5.64	81	14	169	225	144
Papanui	7.91	145	18	245	326	181
Riccarton						
Shirley	<u>29.28</u>	<u>459</u>	16	<u>878</u>	<u>1171</u>	<u>712</u>
Total	82	1318		2472	3296	1978

Living 2 transition to RMD

Centre name	Hectares L2	Existing Households	Existing Density (h/ha)	Theoretical RMD Yield (@30 h/ha)	Theoretical RMD Yield (@40 h/ha)	Net theoretical RMD Yield (@40 h/ha)	Total Net (L1 and L2 change @40 h/ha)
Bishopdale							732
Hornby	2.51	45	18	75	100	55	264
Merivale	29.86	594	21	837	1116	522	666
Linwood	1.11	29	26	33	44	18	18
Papanui	19.76	398	20	592	790	392	573
Riccarton	1.09	28	26	32	43	15	15
Shirley							712
Total	53.33	1094		1569	2093	1002	2980
Overall Totals	137	2412		4041	5389	2980	

Table 5

Existing Living 2/3						
Zone	Net Area	Existing Number Rating Units	Theoretical Gross Yield @30 hh/h	Theoretical Gross Yield @40 hh/h LIVING 3 and @30 hh/h LIVING 2	Net Yield @30 hh/h	Net Yield @60 hh/h LIVING 3 and @30 hh/h LIVING 2
Operative LIVING 3	537	15,005	16,110	21,480	1105	6475
Operative LIVING 2	696	12,959	20,872	20,872	7913	7913
Totals	1233	27,964	36,982	53,092	9018	14,388

Taken together, the existing Operative Living 3 zone transitioning to the RMD zone, and the operative Living 2 transitioning to Residential Suburban Density Transition (i.e. retaining the Living 2 provisions) provide a substantial source of capacity for intensification. In combination with the RMD zoned areas around centres and the Central City, there is theoretically sufficient capacity for supply to meet projected housing demand for intensification, particularly in the planning period of 2016 to 2021.

5.4 Conclusions

1. Areas around centres have been identified as the most appropriate locations for the RMD zone.
2. A number of areas have been identified as for future investigation. This is for a variety of reason but will enable a further increase in the supply of land for intensification to take place when and where it is most appropriate.
3. When considered with the potential for intensification to occur in existing area of operative Living 2 and Living 3 zones, the extent of the area identified for the RMD zone around centres is sufficient to meet the anticipated demand for intensification in at least the 2016—2021 period. The areas identified as for future investigation represent an opportunity to increase supply in the future should it be required to meet demand after 2021.

Bibliography

1. Christchurch City Council, Jasmex. 2012. *Exploring New Housing Choices for Changing Lifestyles*. Christchurch City Council. Christchurch.
2. *Johnsonville Community Association Incorporated vs. Wellington City Council* (2013) NZEnvC 159 ENV-2010-WLG-000127.
3. Christchurch City Council. 2009. *Household Capacity within Living 2 and 3 in Christchurch Under Current City Plan Provisions (Draft)*. Christchurch City Council. Christchurch.
4. Abley Transportation Engineers Limited. 2008. *Residential Intensification*. Christchurch.
5. Abley, S., Chou, M., Douglass, M.,. 2008. National Travel Profiles Part A: Description of Daily Travel Patterns. *Land Transport New Zealand Research Report 353*. New Zealand Transport Agency, Auckland.
6. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority. 2013. *Land Use Recovery Plan*. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority, Christchurch.
7. Environment Canterbury. 2009 (amended 2013). *Regional Policy Statement*. Environment Canterbury, Christchurch.
8. Environment Canterbury. 2013. *Regional Public Transport Plan 2012*. Environment Canterbury, Christchurch.
9. Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, New Zealand Transport Agency. 2007. *Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy*. Environment Canterbury, Christchurch.

Attachment 1. Centres of ‘neighbourhood centre’ order or above.

This summarises the outcome of the analysis undertaken to identify which centres should be considered for further investigation.

Green = Centres selected for further consideration.

Red = Centres not selected for further consideration.

Centre	Status: Existing & <u>DPR</u> <u>proposed</u>	Full Size (>1000m2 gfa) Supermar ket	Non-retail Services	Residen tial Zone within 450m buffer	Transport	Highest order Open Space (within 450m buffer)	Analysis and comments	Conclusion	Notes or factors for consideration. Infrastructure constraints.
Barrington	KAC (RPS) <u>Large Neighbourh ood.</u>	Yes	Full range	Living 1, Living 2	Core Bus Route Major cycle route.	Open Space 2 (Barrington Park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive Living 2 zone. • Some occurrence of infill (back section subdivision) and EPH type development but mainly single house sections remain. • Long blocks east to west orientation to centre, require mid-block zone split. • Some cul-de-sacs. • Recent expansion to Mall has increased the quantity and range of services provided. • Mix of older housing with some more recent. Some streets are very well established and maintained, others not so much. Significant variance across study area. • Waste water is an existing capacity constraint. Existing overflows are an issue for pump station 20. Any 	Potential for medium density exists. EDM applicable over a large extent of the area.	Waste water engineers advise that there is a current constraint that will be resolved in 8-10 years. Issue will be clearer once SCIRT works in the area are complete.

							<p>intensification has the potential to add additional demand for this system. Works to increase capacity are programmed (but not currently funded). This is fundamentally an issue of timing and rate of change. If the realisation of development potential is slow then rezoning would not be an issue (and could help guide future infrastructure funding). The constraint is concerned more with the rate of change to medium density rather than change itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence of obvious boundaries in most directions from the centre except for the existing Living 3 to the north. Boundary will likely have to be based on the catchment area. 		
Belfast	KAC (RPS) <u>District (Emerging)</u>	Yes	Medium	Living 1. (also Rural land identified for rezoning for residential)	Core Bus Route. Major cycle route.	Open Space 2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Northwood subdivision is a significant component of land within the catchment of the centre. Most homes are less than 15 years old so redevelopment potential is limited for foreseeable future. Northwood includes elements of medium density as part of the original subdivision plan. Low rise typologies, single storey. Business 2 growth anticipated. Greenfield growth in the area supports the centre and is also likely to include a degree of medium density. 	Limited immediate potential based on property age in the area. Centre will be supported by new Greenfield development.	Should be considered in future review once building age is more conducive to redevelopment.
Halswell	KAC (RPS)	Yes	Medium	Living 1	Core Bus	Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing work with Sparks Road 	In terms of	KAC status to

(existing commercial area)	<u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>				Route. Major cycle route.	2	<p>development. KAC status will transfer to the new location. New Greenfield areas will include medium density type development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly serving existing and new Greenfield. Sufficient growth to support centre without the need for new medium density. • Peripheral location. • Mix of older housing and newer subdivisions. However, the rate of change would likely be slow. 	supporting the centre there may be no need for medium density as anticipated Greenfield growth will support the centre. KAC status will transfer to a new centre which will be the focus for future investment and transport planning.	move to the new Sparks Road centre.
Hornby	KAC (RPS) <u>District</u>	Yes	Full	Living 1, Living 2	Core Bus Route. Major cycle route.	Open Space 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B5 industrial zones introduce reverse sensitivity concerns. • Significant service, commercial and industrial growth occurring and anticipated. Demand for housing likely to increase. • Analysis suggests areas to the west and north-west are the most accessible locations. If Denton park also counted (sports park) then also areas to south of the mall area accessible). • Prevailing development form is generally low, single storey in the residential area. • Some new Greenfield growth in the area supports centre (in addition to 	Potential for medium density exists.	No overall infrastructure constraint.

							<p>strong support from industrial activity surrounding the centre).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denton Park is zoned for Open Space 3 but essentially serves the same function as an Open Space 2 park. • Relatively low damage area for earthquakes and more recent housing. 		
Linwood/ Eastgate	KAC (RPS) <u>District</u>	Yes	Full	Living 1, Living 2	Core Bus Route. Major cycle route.	OPEN SPACE 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly single storey houses in the Living 1 and Living 2 zones. Limited infill. • Accessibility analysis suggests large areas with good accessibility around centre and to open space. • The Living 3 zone close to centre has significant 1960s 'sausage flat' style development. • Older housing stock on the whole. Rate of change may be faster but noting that change in adjoining Living 3 area has been slow and sporadic in some parts. • Large area of Living 2 appears suitable. Limited expansion in to Living 1 also suitable. • Existing boundary with Living 3 to the east provides a western limit for rezoned areas. To the north and south the boundary is more likely to be catchment based. 	Potential for medium density exists.	Flood/Sea level /Land Drainage infrastructure may be a factor and requires further investigation however it is not an impediment to intensification. No overall constraint with other infrastructure.
New Brighton	KAC (RPS) <u>Large Neighbourh</u>	Yes	Full	Living 1, Living2, Living 3, Living 4	Core Bus Route. Major	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning exists for higher density around the KAC. One of the few areas with Living 4 zoned land outside the Central City. Development potential of these 	Existing provision for medium density and natural	Revised Tsunami risk confirms need for avoidance

	<u>ood.</u>				cycle route.		<p>zoned areas has yet to be extensively exploited so significant capacity exists already.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Tsunami risk area. A greater understanding of the Tsunami risk has developed since the plan change that rezoned areas of New Brighton. 	hazard risk. No further consideration.	of the area.
Papanui	KAC (RPS) <u>District</u>	Yes	Full	Living 1, Living 2, Living 3	Core Bus Route. Two major cycle routes.	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a Business 5 zoned brownfield area. Currently subject to resource consent interest for commercial use. Reverse sensitivity buffer around this centre will be a determining factor for the western boundary of rezoning. • Potential development of western end of Cranford Basin will support centre. • Existing Living 2 has some infill and subdivision but not extensive. • Mix of housing ages, some older, some recent. Pattern and rate of change is difficult to predict. Noting that change in existing Living 3 appears to be sporadic. • SAm within the catchment may present some issues around rezoning to the west of the centre. • Cranford Basin could provide the boundary of rezoning to the east. To the north this is likely to be the transition into other uses (schools, Business). 	Potential for medium density exists.	Future of Business 5 site to be determined. No overall constraint with infrastructure.
Riccarton	KAC (RPS) <u>District</u>	Yes	Full	Living 1, Living 2, Living 3	Core Bus Route.	C3 (Riccarton Bush).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive area of Living 3 zone to the south of centre. Areas of Living 2 zone and Living 1 zone around the centre is 	Potential for medium density exists.	Known waste water constraint

						Hagley Park at the edge of catchment.	<p>limited also by other uses in extensive Business 1 zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within an area of waste water constraint. This is due to be resolved 2018-2020. • Boundary to the north provided by the edge of Riccarton Bush and presence of the river. • Edge of existing Living 3 zones provide the boundary to the east and south. • SAm to the west provides a logical boundary. 		exists for part of the area. This is related to the Riccarton Interceptor.
Shirley	KAC (RPS) <u>District</u>	Yes	Full	Living 1	Core Bus Route	Some Open Space 1 but lack of substantial areas of public Open Space within the immediate catchment (private Open Space is present). Noting Open Space 2 on periphery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive area of predominantly single storey Living 1. • Mix of housing, significant HNZ holdings. • Access to Open Space immediately adjacent to study area, but none close to centre. • Generally 1940-1970s housing with some areas of newer housing. • Rate of change may be slow. 	Potential for medium density exists.	Some capacity issues on infrastructure may limit potential in area.
Addington	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourh</u>	No	Some	Living 3	Core Bus Route. Two	Open Space 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Living 3 Zone supports intensification already. 	Existing zone supports intensification. No further	

	<u>ood.</u>				major cycle routes pass through suburb.			consideration.	
Aranui	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	No	No	Living 1	Core Bus Route.	OPEN SPACE 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small Business 2 retail centre but with a significant proportion of vacant lots. • Does not provide the range of services to support a higher density of population. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Avonhead	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Limited	Living 1	Non-core Bus route.	OPEN SPACE 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium size retail focused centre. Peripheral location and not on a core route. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Bishopdale	Business 2 <u>Large Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Library, recreation	Living 1	Non-core Bus route. Major cycle route.	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large Business 2 shopping centre. Range of retail shops. YMCA recreation centre. Community Preschool. Public bars. • The centre is comparable in size and scope to some smaller KACs. • Centre would likely benefit from a higher household population in immediate catchment due to proximity of centre to Northlands (i.e. that centre attracts destination shoppers). • Existing Living 1 area a mix of density and lot sizes. Potential capacity is reasonably good. • General absence of logical boundary so 	Potential for medium density exists.	No overall infrastructure constraint.

							boundary for rezoning will be largely determined by the centre catchment.		
Main North Rd/Richell St (Belfast)	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	No	Medical support service.	Living 1	Core Bus Route. Major cycle route.	Open Space 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small retail focused centre. Peripheral location. • Shopping area to south probably draws destinations shoppers. • Potential for strip of higher density around Main North Road (traffic analysis not done on this). • Limited higher density would help support local centre. • Belfast '293' area likely to also provide additional support to centre. • B5 (freezing works) is close to centre and is a buffer issue until rezoning to alternative use confirmed. 	Limited intensification may be appropriate in the future close to main road. However overall the centre does not support intensification across a wider area.	
Edgware	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	No (but large supervalue supermarket)		Living 2, Living 3	Non-core Bus route.	Limited. English Park and former pool site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small retail focused Business 2 centre. Located next to inner ring of Living 3 zone. Small supermarket, fast food shops, restaurant. • Significant infill and townhouse redevelopment in Living 3 areas to the south of centre. Some vacant sites available also for development. 	Not an appropriate range of services to support more intensification than already provided for.	Suburban Centre MP
Greers/Wairakei Rd	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	No (supervalue)		Living 1	Core Bus Route.	Open Space 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small supermarket, independent retail, fast food. Not an appropriate range of services to support significantly increased medium density population. 	No further consideration.	
Merivale	Business 2	Yes	Limited	Living 2,	Core Bus	Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large Business 2 retail focused centre 	Potential for	Waste water

	<u>Large Neighbourhood.</u>			Living 1	Route.	1 (pocket park only).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> on busy arterial road. Lacks Open Space but the centre located with good access to nearby facilities. Broad area to consult on but expectation is for a much reduced area, perhaps pockets within 400m. Existing Living 2 zone largely built out, limiting potential for redevelopment. Larger sections have generally larger buildings. Density may be achieved through other mechanisms. Areas with small sections will not lend easily to subdivision without significant amalgamation. Large variation in house typologies and age around the centre. Two SAs within catchment and provide a potential boundary to the north of the centre. Extensive Business 1 area and other uses (hospital, schools). Business area to the south provides the boundary. Boundary to the east and west more dependent on the distance from the centre. 	medium density exists.	capacity for Papanui Road. South of Merivale mall is better due to feeding into the central catchment. Some capacity available to accommodate intensification.
Richmond	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Limited	Living 3, Living 2, Living 1	Non-core Bus route.	Open Space 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linear centre (Business 2 covers supermarket area). Existing Living 3 zone is extensive and enabling of medium density. 	Existing zone supports intensification. No further consideration.	
Linwood Village	Business 2	No (small supervalu	Limited (damaged	Living 3, Living 2	Non-core Bus route.	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive Living 3 zone supports intensification already. 	Existing zone supports	Suburban Centre MP

	<u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	e)	centre)		Major cycle route.			intensification. No further consideration.	
St Martins	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Limited, community library	LIVING 1	Core Bus Route.	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small supermarket based centre. Limited number of other shops and services with limited opportunities for significant expansion beyond these. • Some new units created by New World redevelopment. • Extensive development to EPH and infill evident, in effect providing medium density development in the area. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Hillmorton	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	No	Limited	LIVING 1	Core Bus Route	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small Business 2 retail centre. Lacking a supermarket. Would not provide the range of services to support a higher density of population. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Parklands	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Limited	LIVING 1	Core Bus Route	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supermarket and provides a range of commercial facilities but fewer other services. • Peripheral location. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Bush Inn / Church Corner	Business 2 <u>Large Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Some, Medical centre	LIVING 2, LIVING 1	Core Bus Route. Major cycle route.	Open Space 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large BUSINESS 2 shopping centre. Range of retail shops. Medical centre nearby. • The centre is comparable in size and scope to some smaller KACs • Close to university activity and existing 	Potential for medium density exists.	Within the catchment of the Riccarton Interceptor. Capacity constrained

							<p>university associated higher density developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Living 2 could form basis of a core up zone area. Need to retain distinction between nearby Riccarton. Potential for medium density along Riccarton Road should be considered. SAm close to centre, HNZ dominated. Focus should be on area to the north of centre where medium density already exists in pockets (pre-dating current zone in some cases). 		until this is in place (projected for 2018-2020)
Fendalton (Memorial/Otara)	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	Medical Centre	Living 1	Core Bus Route	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small supermarket dominated centre. Medical centre part of the centre. A more centrally location small Business 2. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Fendalton Village	Business 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	No (supervalue)		Living 1	Non-core bus route.	None.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convenience retail focused centre. Small supermarket. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	
Ferrymead	B4 <u>Large Neighbourhood.</u>	Yes	No	B4, C1, C1A, Living 1	Core Bus Route. Two major cycle routes.	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small area of Living 1 within catchment but actually disconnected from centre. Would create an isolated pocket of medium density if rezoned. Other zoning around centre is predominantly industrial, special purpose or Living Hills and therefore 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	

							out of scope.		
Sydenham	BUSINESS 2 <u>Large Neighbourhood.</u>	No	Some	LIVING 3 (B3 dominates)	Core Bus Route.	Open Space 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large Business 2 centre within B3 area. Nearest Living zone to the south is Living 3, already enabling medium density and development to this density within the area. 	Existing residential zone (LIVING 3) already supports intensification. No further consideration.	Suburban Centre MP
Sumner	BUSINESS 2 <u>None</u>	Yes	Some	LIVING 1, LIVING 2, LIVING 3, LH	Core Bus Route. Coastal pathway (cycle route)	Open Space 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium size destination centre serves local community and visitors. Extensive medium density areas exist. An area at higher risk from Tsunami damage. 	Not a suitable centre to support further intensification. No further consideration.	Suburban Centre MP
Redcliffs	BUSINESS 2 <u>Small Neighbourhood.</u>	Potentially			Core Bus Route. Coastal pathway (cycle route)	Open Space 1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centre does not provide the range of services and facilities needed to support a significant increase in population. 	Not a suitable centre to support intensification. No further consideration.	

Attachment 2. Stage 2. Centre Analysis.

Note: Analysis is confined to discussion of the areas within the Stage 1 RMD zone boundary. No expansion beyond what was proposed is discussed or recommended. 'Block' descriptions are for general reference. The planning maps that form part of the draft District Plan should be consulted for clarity.

The notes on consultation are drawn from the 'District Plan Review. Community Consultation for First Chapters' (Christchurch City Council, April 2014).

Barrington	<p>The regular grid of streets provides good access to the KAC from a large extent of the surrounding residential area. There are few barriers to access or logical boundaries. The potential Stage 1 RMD zone was extensive based on accessibility to the centre and some rationalisation of supply is warranted.</p> <p>A significant extent of the Stage 1 RMD zone also meets the criteria for the Enhanced Development Mechanism and on this basis was further reason to reduce the Stage 1 RMD zone and also consider much of the area for future investigation, to be reconsidered closer to the review of the EDM. All of the area around Barrington has been removed from the RMD zone for this reason. Some parts are recommended as for FIA status.</p> <p>The Barrington area has a wastewater capacity constraint. This will be resolved in time so limited intensification in the short-term is appropriate, with further review recommended once the capacity is available.</p> <p>Public Opinion:</p> <p>Responses from effected parties to the proposed RMD zone were mixed but the overall consensus was against any change in density. The main reasons given concern the potential change to the family orientated housing environment and concern over the ability of local roads and services to cope with increased demand. Those in support cited reasons of housing diversity, affordability and choice within areas accessible to the KAC.</p>				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work (FIA).	Comment.
Barrington Street, Bewdley Street, Stourbridge Street.	RSDT	Distance to KAC. Rationalisation of supply. Infrastructure (waste water).	This area is the less accessible to the KAC than other areas. Removed to reduce overall impact on infrastructure.	N/A	EDM still applies in part. Operative Living 2 transitions to RSDT which enables low-medium density up to

					30 households per hectare.
South east of Milton Street.	RSDT	Distance to KAC for some parts of the blocks. Infrastructure (waste water).	Less accessible than other areas due to long block lengths. Reduce overall impact on infrastructure.	N/A	EDM still applies in part. Operative Living 2 transitions to RSDT which enables low-medium density up to 30 households per hectare.
Between Frankleigh Street, Barrington and Rahera Street.	RSDT	Distance to KAC. Infrastructure (waste water).	Short (400m), direct access to KAC and Barrington Park. Strong correlation with EDM criteria. Reduce overall impact on infrastructure.	Reassess when EDM is reviewed. Review infrastructure capacity.	Includes a large mid-block parcel currently in non-residential use. Located Stourbridge, Barrington and Frankleigh Street. EDM still applies in part. Operative Living 2 transitions to RSDT which enables low-medium density up to 30 households per hectare.
Area to the north of Barrington St. and Milton St.	RSDT	Distance to KAC. Contiguous with Living 3. Strong correlation with EDM.	There is a strong correlation with the EDM in this area. It is accessible to the KAC and closest to/adjoins the existing Living 3 zone that will transition to RMD. Reduce overall impact on	Reassess when EDM is reviewed. Review infrastructure capacity.	EDM still applies in part. Operative Living 2 transitions to RSDT which enables low-medium density up to

		Infrastructure (waste water).	infrastructure.		30 households per hectare.
Bishopdale	Overall the extent of the proposed RMD zone was considered greater than was required for the centre. There has been a focus on limiting the RMD to those urban blocks with the greatest access to both the centre and the larger areas of public open space. Harewood Road was identified as a potential barrier to access from areas to the north east of the centre. Public Opinion: Opinion on the extent of proposed zone was mixed. Some respondents expressed support for increasing the range of housing choice within the area around the centre. Other respondents were concerned about the potential for change, citing the stable, family orientated nature of much of the area as a reason to avoid change.				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
Between Harewood and Isleworth Road.	RS.	Building age. Potential for change. Existing density. Road layout. Access to centre.	This area contains newer buildings and has been extensively subdivided. Sections are generally smaller. A number of cul-de-sacs reduce accessibility to the centre.	N/A	
Between Raleigh Street and Isleworth Road. Blocks either side of Farrington Ave to Harewood Road.	RMD	Access to centre. Section size. Building age.	This area has good access to the centre and parks. Section sizes are large and consistent. Building age is generally consistent 1960s.	N/A	
South east of Maple Street and Stackhouse Avenue.	RS	Access to centre. Access to Open Space. Supply.	Streets are less accessible due to long block lengths. Further from Open Space (aside from a pocket park).	N/A	
Block contained by Harewood Road, Highstead Road, Colesbury Street, Cotswold Ave.	RMD	Access to centre, open space. Supply.	Considered to have the greatest degree of access to the centre and open space of the block to the north-east of Harewood Road.	N/A	
North east of	RS	Access to centre,	The area is less accessible to both the	Review for supply	

Harewood Road.		high traffic road barrier. Access to Open Space. Supply.	centre and Open Space due to distance and access across Harewood Road. Better options exists that provide sufficient RMD zoned land in the area.	reasons.	
Church Corner.	Church Corner is within the catchment of the Riccarton Interceptor. This is a wastewater infrastructure capacity constraint. A significant extent of the Stage 1 RMD zone also meets the criteria for the Enhanced Development Mechanism and on this basis was further reason to avoid a RMD zone in this area at this time. The EDM enables medium-density development to occur on a site by site assessment basis. The provision of zoning to enable medium-density in the long term around Church Corner should be reviewed when the waste water capacity constraint is resolved and when the EDM is reviewed.				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
All.	RS RSDT close to centre.	Infrastructure capacity.	Insufficient wastewater capacity exists to support a general transition to medium density at this time.	Review when capacity constraint is resolved.	EDM may apply in part to the area once the waste water capacity constraint is resolved. This may be on a localised bases within the catchment of pump station 126. The EDM will allow development on a site-by-site assessed basis to occur. The RSDT enables low-to medium density development to occur in some areas.
Hornby	The scope for RMD near to the KAC was limited due to the location of the KAC adjacent to industrial areas (Business zones 4 and 5). This excluded the residential areas closest to the KAC from consideration and isolated a pocket of potential RMD zone. Kyle				

	<p>and Denton park are also located adjacent to the centre, increasing the distance for walking access to the centre from residential areas to the west and north.</p> <p>The focus for Stage 2 has been on consolidating the RMD area to those locations with the best access to the KAC and Open Space. These are found immediately to the north of Kyle Park and to the west of Denton Park. The area to the south east of the KAC was considered incongruous given that it would be surrounded by lower density residential form. This area was removed.</p> <p>Public Opinion: Concern was expressed over the potential for change in the area. Of particular concern was an erosion of the family friendly aspects of the area that may result in a change to housing typologies.</p>				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
Block to south east.	RS	Urban form. Access and severance from KAC. Open Space.	Generally poorer access than other options around Hornby. Main South Road is a significant barrier to the bulk of activity to the north of the KAC. The area stood alone as a result of the buffer around the Business 5 zone. The urban form outcome was therefore inconsistent. There is less provision for Open Space in this area.	N/A	
Parcels on Waterloo Road and Taurima Street.	RMD	Access to KAC. Access to Open Space. Urban design outcomes. Building age.	Good access to KAC across Kyle Park and adjacent to Open Space. A number of corner sites and lot size support good urban design outcomes. This is one of the better locations to support supply in Hornby.	N/A	Pedestrian underpass in need to upgrade.
Block between Parker Street and Denton Park.	RMD	Access to KAC Access to Open Space. Building age.	The block has good access to the KAC either along Main South Road or across Denton Park. Lot sizes support good urban design	N/A	

			outcomes. This is one of the better locations to support supply in Hornby.		
Blocks between Foremans Road, Parker Street, Denise Crescent and Springmead Place.	RS	Access to KAC. Supply.	Greater distance from KAC but reasonably accessible to Open Space. Other areas better options at this stage.	N/A	
Blocks north of Waterloo Road (excluding RMD).	RS	Access to KAC	Greater distance from KAC but reasonably accessible to Open Space. Other areas better options at this stage.	N/A	
Merivale	<p>Merivale is the most densely developed of the all the centres. Considerable development has taken place around the centre to yield a density of development in close to 30 households per hectare in some areas (the upper limit of the Living 2 zone which covers much of the area). Analysis of the building age shows that there are many new buildings.</p> <p>The extent of the RMD zone has been refined to exclude areas where 30 households per hectare has been largely achieved through recent development under Living 2. Some provision for RMD needs to be retained and this has been concentrated to the east of the KAC where less development has taken place and the potential for medium density is greater.</p> <p>Public Opinion: Overall the community was not in favour on intensification. Specific concerns were around density and more housing impacting on the existing residents.</p>				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
West of Papanui Road Operative L2 zone.	RMD	Access to KAC. Existing development and density. Potential for change.	Significant parts of this area have already been developed to medium density. Most recent development has reached close to 30 households per hectare. There is limited potential for further development given the scale of redevelopment already achieved. A transition to the RMD zone will acknowledge that this is an area that	N/A	The density in this area is already relatively high for a Living 2 zone and therefore the increase beyond this will be modest. This is consistent with the availability of infrastructure capacity

			has already moved significantly to a medium density form and where demand is established. It is acknowledged that this area has some narrow streets and that on-street parking is already heavily utilised. The Transport Chapter of the DPR addresses the issue of parking demand in medium density development.		in the area.
East of Papanui Road.	RMD	Access to KAC Potential for development. Supply.	Overall this area has not been as extensively developed as elsewhere around the KAC. It is readily accessible being mostly with 400 meters walking distance of the KAC. Potential for change here remains and is considered the most appropriate area for the provision of medium density around Merivale.	N/A	The provision of Open Space in the centre of the KAC is limited.
Remainder.	Part RS. Part RSDT.	Access to KAC.	The remainder of the proposed RMD zone identified in stage 1 has been excluded, being a greater distance from the KAC and therefore relatively less accessible.	N/A	RSDT enables low-medium density development up to 30 households per hectare. There is in general an uptake of this density in the area.
Papanui	The overall extent of the RMD zone was considered too large for the KAC. The focus for Stage 2 was on identifying a core area with high accessibility for RMD, with consideration given to the potential development near to the centre (e.g. Cranford Basin). The extent of the operative Living 2 zone was identified as largely an appropriate extent. One area was identified as a potential future area for investigation. The railway line is considered a significant barrier to access and so the proposed RMD extent is				

	<p>reduced to the west.</p> <p>Public Opinion: Overall there was general disagreement with intensification proposals. Reasons given were around the impact of a greater population on existing traffic and parking pressures in the area. Other concerns were expressed regarding the potential for poor design outcomes.</p> <p>Public opinion: Overall there was more respondents disagreed with increasing density. Specific concerns were expressed around the impact on traffic given that congestion is already a concern in the area. Concerns were also expressed in regard to the impact on existing character of some streets further from the centre.</p>				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
Area of Operative Living 2. (east of rail line).	RMD	Access to KAC. Supply. Potential for change.	This area was considered to have the best access to the core of the KAC. Some medium density development has occurred in the area but there capacity for redevelopment exists.	N/A	
Area of Operative Living 2. (west of rail line, south of Harewood Road).	RSDT	Access to KAC Supply. SAM boundary.	This area has reduced access to the KAC due to the railway. The area of existing Living 2 adjoins and covers the St James Street SAM. This area is reclassified as FIA in order to address the impact on the SAM in Phase 2 of the DPR.	Impact on SAM. Phase 2 DPR. Review for the purposes of future land supply.	RSDT enables low-medium density development up to 30 households per hectare.
Area between Living 2 and Cranford Basin (either side of Shearer Avenue and Apollo Place).	RMD	Access to KAC. Potential for change. Interface with Cranford Basin area.	This area has good access to the KAC, in particular Northlands Mall. It was considered the most suitable area for increasing the land supply for intensification in Papanui.	N/A.	
Area to the north of the operative Living 2 zone (Vagues Road, either side of Main	RS	Access to KAC. Supply.	This area is still reasonably accessible to the KAC but was excluded at this stage due to the extent of potential RMD provided closer to the centre.	Review for the purposes of future land supply.	

North Road.					
Remainder.	RS	Access to KAC. Supply.	This covers the areas that were at the periphery of the of the accessible area. For reasons of over supply around Papanui these areas are less desirable for intensification than other options.	N/A.	
Riccarton	<p>The overall extent of the potential zone was considered somewhat in excess of what was required. Issues with development to the north of Riccarton Road were highlighted. As a result the focus for intensification is on the area to the west of the existing Living 3 zone. The full extent of the potential RMD area has been reduced to a single block north of Riccarton Road. Of the remaining areas the blocks nearest to Riccarton Road have been reclassified as FIA. All other areas were removed from RMD.</p> <p>Public Opinion: Overall the community response to the potential RMD zone varied depending on the particular area of focus. There was strong opposition to intensification in various parts of the area (but not the whole area) to the north of Riccarton Road. There was less concern about intensification to the area to the west of the existing Living 3 zone. Overall there was a general disagreement with more intensification around the Riccarton area. The main concern was the impact on the environment in terms of poor urban design outcomes, a perceived risk of over development and in particular pressure on the road network and parking. Specifically the existing time limit on parking in some streets was highlighted as a potential barrier to successful intensification that avoids impacts on existing residents. Other respondents welcomed a wider choice of housing types including smaller houses for those who wanted them. Some respondents noted that denser housing would provide more opportunities for first time homebuyers and smaller families.</p>				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
Area west of existing Living 3. Either side of Wainui Street adjacent to Dallas Street.	RMD	Access to KAC Potential for change. Open Space. Supply.	This area is accessible to the KAC and open space. Taking into account the age of the buildings and sporadic subdivision this area is considered to have potential for change. It is outside the catchment for pump station 126 and there are no localised infrastructure constraints.	N/A	N/A

Area south of Dallas Street, either side of Wainui Street (excluding area identified near to Dallas Street).	RSDT	Access to KAC. Potential for change. Supply. Infrastructure. EDM.	This area is within the catchment for pump station 126 indicating a general capacity constraint. Medium density is enabled via the EDM on a site by site assessment bases.	Further review when the EDM expires.	EDM may apply in part to the area where the waste water capacity constraint is resolved. This can be tested on a site by site basis at present. Note that RSDT enables up to 30 households per hectare.
Block bordered by Kilmarnock Street, Harakeke Street, Straven Road.	RMD	Access to KAC. Potential for change. Supply.	The area is accessible to the KAC. Development in this block is less than others and larger lot sizes remain in place (including some vacant lots). As a result development potential is greater.	N/A	
North of Kilmarnock Street, south of Maitai Street.	RS	Development Potential, existing zone.	These blocks are less accessible than other areas. For reasons of supply there is no compelling need to consider these blocks.	N/A	
North of Riccarton Road.	RS RSDT	Existing development. Access to KAC. Parking constraints. Supply.	Parking constraints exist for this area which prevents resident parking. Existing pattern of development partly support intensification and the area has good access to the KAC. Recent localised waste water modelling (April 2014) has indicated that there are localised constraints affecting these blocks.	N/A	RSDT will allow (as does operative Living 2) medium density development up to 30 households per hectare in some parts of this area.
Area along Riccarton	TBC (Phase	Residential use	Another zone classification may be	Appropriate zone for	

Road, opposite Matipo Street.	2).	sporadic. Dominance of motel accommodation.	more appropriate for the area. To be examined as part of Phase 2 of the District Plan Review.	existing activities.	
Shirley	<p>The overall approach was to reduce the extent of the RMD zone to the urban blocks closest to the KAC and focus on those blocks where development potential was higher.</p> <p>Public Opinion: Overall opinion on increasing housing density around the KAC was balanced. Concerns were raised in general around raising the population and altering the composition of neighbourhoods, with smaller homes discouraging families from the area. Some expressed a preference for higher density around open space rather than the KAC. Some respondents welcomed more housing supply and choice of housing for a wider range of the population. Others welcomed the greater opportunities for community and social interaction associated with medium density, community focused developments.</p>				
'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work	Comment.
Blocks to the south of New Brighton Road and north of Achilles Street.	RMD	Access to KAC. Potential for development. Access to open space.	This area has good access to the KAC. Section sizes are large. There is a periphery of older dwellings around newer infill which is to a higher density. This has the potential to transition to medium density. Better access to open space than other areas.	N/A	
Block south of Shirley Road around Warden Avenue.	RMD	Access to KAC. Potential for development.	This area has good access to the KAC. Section sizes are large and some redevelopment has taken place. This area has a number of sites left vacant as a result of earthquake damage so allowing good comprehensive development options.	N/A	
Blocks to the north of Shirley Road and west of Marshlands Road to	RMD	Access to KAC. Supply. Potential for	These areas have good access to the KAC. Sites are generally large with little subdivision allowing good	N/A	

Sabina Street.		development.	potential for redevelopment. Housing stock also is generally older.		
Block to the north and east of The Palms.	RMD	Access to KAC. Supply. Potential for development. Access to open space.	Areas with good access to KAC. Large lots and some older housing stock means a high potential for redevelopment. Better access to open space than other areas.	N/A	
Remainder of area to the north and west of the KAC.	RS	Not required due to supply at this time.	Reasonable access to the KAC.	Provision of open space.	
East of Bampton Street.	RS	Supply. Urban form.	Partial block suitable for RMD due to access.	Review for supply.	
Shirley Boys High School grounds.	CU3 (Operative)	Future development potential.	Site has potential for residential development in the future. Medium density form should be considered.	Review when sites becomes available for development.	Cultural overlay is the operative zone. This will need to be reviewed once the future of the site is determined.
Linwood	<p>The area of RMD around Linwood was removed except for two small areas adjacent to Linwood Park. The reasons for this are the proximity of the Linwood centre to the area of exiting Living 3 between Linwood and the Central City and the impact on the character of the area. In particular through the assessment process concern was expressed that the potential medium density built form outcomes will not be compatible with the socio-economic demographic of the area. Some provision has been made for a increase in density through transition of the existing Living 1 area to the east and north-east of the mall to the proposed Residential Medium Density Transition zone. It is also noted that the Enhanced Development Mechanism continues to apply to much of the area.</p> <p>Public opinion: Concerns were raised regarding the impact of additional traffic that may result from an increase in density. Other concerns were raised regarding the impact on existing properties from new development in close proximity. The potential for a change in the composition of the population (away from family housing) that comes with a change in housing typologies was also identified as a particular concern by the community.</p>				

'Block'	Stage 2 Zone.	Key criteria	Discussion	Scope for further work (FIA).	Comment.
East of Aldwins Road, south of Linwood Avenue.	RSDD	Potential for development. KAC Access. Existing mechanism.	This area is extensively developed with a number of medium density developments achieved through the existing Living 2 zone. Area has less potential for change. The EMD applies over much of the area.	Supply and integration. Impact of EDM.	EDM qualification applies in part to this area.
South of Linwood Park.	RSDD	Access. Character.	This area was considered to be accessible but only to pedestrian traffic via one route (across Linwood Park). The road layout does not support access to the centre by alternative routes. The area is also an area of relatively intact character close to the Linwood Centre.		EDM continues to apply over much of this area.
West of Linwood Park	RMD	Access	These two blocks are largely transitioned to medium density through the provision so the existing zone. They are well located to support medium density development.	N/A	
East of the Mall Existing Living 1 area (limited to the area included in the initial consultation.)	RSDD	Access to centre.	Transition to RMD was considered to be too greater transition from the existing built form in this area. Some provision for extra density is appropriate which will be enabled by a transition to the RSDD zone.	N/A	EDM will therefore apply over much of this area.