

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHĪ

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on Private Plan Change 23
Whisper Creek, Spencerville to the Christchurch District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CRAIG FRIEDEL, PLANNING, ON BEHALF OF
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

Dated: 21 May 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My full name is Craig Robert Friedel. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief (**EiC**), and I reiterate that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court.
2. I prepared the Section 42A Officer Report on Private Plan Change 23 Whisper Creek to the Operative Christchurch District Plan (**PPC23**). I have subsequently reviewed the Proponent's evidence circulated on Tuesday 5 May 2026, the submitter evidence and supplementary statements circulated on Tuesday 12 May 2026, and the Joint Witness Statements (**JWS**) and Rebuttal evidence circulated on Monday 18 May 2026.
3. There has been significant progress made by the Proponent to address the priority concerns listed in paragraph 1.1.18 of the Section 42A Report, which has been assisted by expert caucusing and the JWS.
4. Appendix 1 of this Summary Statement evaluates the extent to which the evidence has addressed each of these concerns. This establishes that there is either agreement between the experts or that there are appropriate options available to amend the PPC23 Outline Development Plan (**ODP**) to address any remaining areas of disagreement.
5. Overall, I consider that the evidence has appropriately addressed the areas of concern with the rezoning that are recorded in the Section 42A. Where there are disagreements remaining between the experts, I consider that there are options available through amendments to the PPC23 ODP to effectively mitigate these effects.
6. This includes to the extent necessary to ensure that PPC23 is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the Operative Christchurch District Plan (CDP), the applicable planning instruments and national directions and RMA Part 2 matters.

POSITION ON KEY ISSUES

7. This Summary Statement focuses on the positions reached by the various experts on the items listed in paragraph 1.1.18 of the Section 42A Report, which relate to the following key issues:¹

¹ PPC23 Whisper Creek - CCC Section 42A Report, 28 April, para.1.1.8, pg.7&8.

- (a) Housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility.
 - (b) Character, amenity and visual effects.
 - (c) Stormwater management.
 - (d) Transport safety, efficiency, and accessibility.
 - (e) Flooding and geotechnical natural hazard risks.
8. For brevity, I have adapted the schedule prepared by Mr. Cleese in his Planning EIC² to record my position in Appendix 1 of this Summary Statement. This evaluation has considered the Proponent evidence, Submitter evidence and technical reviews, JWS and Rebuttal Evidence.
9. I consider that there is now sufficient evidence to establish the rezoning is appropriate in respect to housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility, water and wastewater servicing, stormwater management, and flood and geotechnical natural hazard risks. I note the Commissioner has signalled that he will likely be seeking clarification from Council's experts on the wastewater and stormwater modelling and related environmental effects, which may require the provision of additional information.
10. Pending any additional advice and information that the Commissioner may require and based on the expert evidence, I am confident that the adverse effects associated with the development that would be enabled by rezoning can be effectively managed by the PPC23 ODP (working in combination with the other CDP objectives, policies and rules and those of other relevant planning instruments).
11. There continues to be areas of disagreement and partial disagreement between the urban design, landscape architects and transport experts. These are recorded in the JWS. As evaluated in Appendix 1, I consider that there are options available to amend the PPC23 ODP to address the remaining areas of disagreement. This includes in respect to integrating the site into the environment, addressing potentially adverse visual effects and ensuring the rezoning will not compromise transport network safety and efficiency.

² PPC23 Whisper Creek – Proponents Planning EIC, 5 May 2026, Appendix 1, pg.52.

12. Appendix 2 of this Summary Statement includes a track-changed PPC23 ODP schedule of amendments. This adds to the PPC23 ODP schedule of amendments contained in Mr. Cleese's EiC, which I understand is the latest version.
13. I acknowledge that some of these amendments have been recommended by Council's experts but are not supported by the Proponent in the JWS or in the Proponents evidence received to date.³ These have been included should the Commissioner consider they are necessary to integrate the site into the receiving environment and to ensure the safety and efficiency of the transport network.
14. I confirm my availability to assist in preparing an amended schedule of amendments with the other Planning experts if that would assist the Commissioner.

CONCLUSION

15. In conclusion and with the caveats recorded in paragraphs 9 and 10 above, I consider that the evidence has appropriately addressed the areas of concern with the rezoning that are recorded in the Section 42A. Where there are disagreements remaining between the experts, I consider that there are options available through amendments to the PPC23 ODP to effectively mitigate any adverse effects arising from the rezoning.
16. I am satisfied that PPC23, as amended by the Proponent, is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the Operative Christchurch District Plan, applicable planning instruments, national direction, and RMA Part 2.
17. Under these circumstances, I recommend that PPC23 is approved subject to the amendments to the ODP recorded in Appendix 2 of this Summary Statement.

Date: 21 May 2026

Craig Friedel, CCC Planning Reporting Officer

³ Including the additional design requirements recommended by Ms. Smetham and Ms. Schröder.

Appendix 1 – Technical Assessments Required to Address Officer Concerns

s.42A Report (1.1.8)		Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
a. <u>Housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility</u> – Economic assessment that:				
(i)	Assesses the economic costs and benefits, including the loss of rural land and other relevant externalities.	Evidence of Mr. Colegrave – paragraphs [26] - [35].	N/A	This concern has been addressed based on Mr. Colegrave and Mr. Yeoman's Economic JWS.
(ii)	Substantiates the basis for relying on 'greenfield' residential development in Rolleston and Rangiora as the primary alternative options for prospective homeowners.	Evidence of Mr. Colegrave – paragraphs [45], [61], and [107] - [110]. Evidence of Mr. Jones – paragraphs [20] and [30] - [34].	N/A	This concern has been addressed based on Mr. Colegrave and Mr. Yeoman's Economic JWS.
(iii)	Substantiates the economic implications of PPC23 on other plan-enabled residential capacity elsewhere in Ōtautahi Christchurch and establishes the economic costs and benefits associated with the rezoning.	Evidence of Mr. Colegrave – paragraphs [17] - [24], [43] - [59] and [72] - [74].	N/A	This concern has been addressed based on Mr. Colegrave and Mr. Yeoman's Economic JWS.
(iv)	Substantiates the plan-enabled residential 'greenfield' capacity in Ōtautahi Christchurch, the extent to which PPC23 contributes to this supply in the short (2028) and medium term (2035) and how the rezoning will contribute to improved housing affordability.	Evidence of Mr. Colegrave – paragraphs [43] - [74] and [77] - [84].	Economic Rebuttal evidence of Mr. Colegrave.	This concern was partially addressed based on Mr. Colegrave and Mr. Yeoman's Economic JWS. Mr. Colegrave's Rebuttal evidence records his methodology for establishing that there is insufficient residential 'greenfield' capacity to meet the estimate medium-term demand. Mr. Yeoman's Summary Statement identifies that there is insufficient evidence to substantiate that there is a medium-term shortfall in plan-enabled 'greenfield' capacity across the City.

s.42A Report (1.1.8)		Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
(v)	Establishes the economic rationale for the 3,000m ² Gross Floor Area (GFA) Neighbourhood Centre and the appropriateness of reducing this to 1,000m ² GFA.	Evidence of Mr. Colegrave – paragraphs [107] - [108]. Evidence of Mr. Compton-Moen – paragraphs [54] - [57] and [124].	N/A	The economic experts could not establish an agreed position on the Neighbourhood Centre footprint Gross Floor Area (GFA). I agree with Mr. Clease that the 3,000m² GFA prescribed in the PPC23 ODP narrative is sufficient to avoid adverse retail distribution effects in the context of the Christchurch District Plan.⁴ However, I am not opposed to prescribing the 1,000m² GFA recommended by Mr. Yeoman in the PPC23 ODP should the Commissioner remain concerned with the economic viability of a 3,000m² GFA Neighbourhood Centre.
b. <u>Character, amenity and visual effects</u> – Landscape and Visual Assessment and Urban Design Assessment that:				
(i)	Assesses the visual effects from the likely increase in ground levels associated with the importation of fill to mitigate the natural hazard risk.	Evidence of Mr. Compton-Moen - paragraphs [75] and [103].	Planning Rebuttal evidence of Mr. Clease.	There is disagreement between the landscape architects and urban designers on the fill depths (varying between 0.5m to 1.0m – Mr. Compton-Moen and between 0.3m to 1.85m – Ms. Smetham) and the extent these will contribute to adverse visual and amenity effects.⁵ The minimum requirements for establishing the fill depths for the Finished Floor Levels and stormwater basins have been confirmed in the Natural Hazards JWS and the Planning Rebuttal evidence. These are consistent with the PPC23 ODP narrative. I understand from Dr. Kearse's Evidence Statement and Mr. Halls Summary Statement that this represents a fill depth of approximately 1.0m in on the upper terrace to support housing platforms. This fill depth is at the upper

⁴ CDP Chapter 15 Commercial - 15.2.2 Objective - Centres-based framework for commercial activities - 15.2.2 - 15.2.2.1 Policy – Role of centres Table 15.1 E.

⁵ PPC23 Whisper Creek JWS Urban Design and Landscape, 18 May 2026, para.26 pg.5.

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
			end of Mr. Compton-Moen's estimate and the mid-range of Ms. Smetham's evidence. I support the inclusion of Ms. Smethams additional ODP requirements to assist in integrating the site into the receiving environment and to mitigate visual effects associated with the increased finished ground levels.
(ii) Assesses the visual effects associated with the SPRZ permitted baseline to evaluate the level of change arising from the rezoning on the receiving environment.	Evidence of Mr. Compton-Moen – paragraphs [28] and [145].	N/A	The Urban Design and Landscape JWS confirms the existing SPRZ forms an important component of the anticipated environment.⁶ There is disagreement between the landscape architects on the level of change that would occur if PPC23 were approved and developed.⁷
(iii) Considers the appropriateness of the recommended mitigation treatments to integrate the boundary lots with the receiving environment and the development controls for inclusion in the ODP to address the identified adverse visual effects (as referenced in <u>paragraph 5.5.7</u> and <u>5.5.13</u> of the Section 42A Report).	Evidence of Mr. Compton-Moen – paragraphs [51] - [52].	N/A	I support the inclusion of Ms. Smethams additional ODP requirements to assist in integrating the site into the receiving environment and to mitigate adverse visual effects. There is disagreement between the landscape architects and urban designers on the requirement for additional ODP requirements (beyond what the Proponent has agreed to through their EiC), including building height reductions/variation (8m to 5m), 3m minimum internal boundary building setback and the use of recessive colours and materials.⁸ I support the inclusion of Ms. Smethams additional ODP requirements to assist in integrating the site into the receiving environment.
			I agree with Mr. Cleese that a cautious approach should be followed when considering the appropriateness of

⁶ PPC23 Whisper Creek JWS Urban Design and Landscape, 18 May 2026, para.8 pg.2.

⁷ PPC23 Whisper Creek JWS Urban Design and Landscape, 18 May 2026, para.30 pg.6.

⁸ PPC23 Whisper Creek JWS Urban Design and Landscape, 18 May 2026, para.27 to 29 pg.5&6.

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
			cross-referencing the Ngāi Subdivision and Development Guidelines, as it is external from the CDP. However, the Urban Design and Landscape JWS reached agreement that it was appropriate for the cultural, landscape and environmentally sustainable design aspects of the guidelines to be referenced in the ODP narrative.⁹ More specific wording is suggested to address Mr. Cleese's concerns.
c. <u>Stormwater management</u> – Infrastructure servicing report that:			
(i) Establishes the future effects of elevated groundwater, combined with long-term Sea-Level Rise (SLR) projections, on the functioning of the proposed stormwater basins and wetlands and how the related effects will be mitigated.	Evidence of Dr. Dark – paragraphs [25] - [33]. Evidence of Mr. Hall – paragraphs [11], [18] - [32] and [67] - [74].	N/A	This concern has been addressed based on Mr. Hall, Mr. Norton and Dr. Darks evidence and the Stormwater and Flooding JWS. Dr. Dark's Summary Statement responds to the concerns Ms. O'Brien expressed in her Rebuttal evidence that the impacts of the rezoning on the groundwater system and the Styx River need to be understood and appropriately managed. I agree with Dr. Darks expert opinion that this can be addressed in the subsequent design and consenting stages.
d. <u>Transport safety, efficiency, and accessibility</u> – Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) that:			
(i) Includes a safety assessment along the Spencerville Road corridor, inclusive of the intersections with Marshland Road and Main North Road to identify any additional mitigation required to offset the increased road safety risks arising from PPC23.	Evidence of Mr. Fuller – paragraphs [30] - [33], and [73].	Planning Rebuttal evidence of Mr. Cleese.	Mr. G. Smith, Mr. Fuller and Mr. D. Smith agree that Safe System Audits will be required for the internal road and road upgrades, including the design of the Turner Road and Teapes Road intersection. The transport experts agree that a Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment (LCSIA) is required for the Spencerville Road rail crossing.

⁹ PPC23 Whisper Creek JWS Urban Design and Landscape, 18 May 2026, para.18 pg.3.

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
			They also agree that Spencerville Road should be upgraded to meet the recommended Levels of Service (LoS), which includes a sealed carriageway width of 7.5m. There is disagreement on the funding mechanism for implementing the findings of the LCSIA and improving the LoS of Spencerville Road, which I consider can be determined at the time of subdivision should the rezoning be approved. Mr. G. Smith and Mr. D. Smith consider that construction phase vehicle movements should be restricted from using Turners Road and that this should be recorded in the PPC23 ODP narrative. Mr. Fuller considers it is more appropriate to manage this through a Construction Management Plan as part of any future subdivision process. I recommend that narrative is included in the PPC23 ODP to restrict any future construction phase movements from using Turners Road. Mr. Clease's Planning Rebuttal evidence records his opinion that a supermarket greater than 1,000m² GFA is unlikely to be viable for the Neighbourhood Centre site. He supports the inclusion of ODP narrative that precludes the establishment and operation of supermarket. He also accepts that 500 rather than 700 residential units is an appropriate threshold for triggering the Turners Road and Marshland Road intersection upgrades. I consider that these ODP amendments are appropriate and recommend they are included in schedule of amendments. This should assist to resolve the area of partial disagreement in the Transport JWS that a

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
(ii)	Includes SIDRA intersection modelling of the Marshland Road, Main North Road and Spencerville Road intersection to determine if additional upgrades are required.	Evidence of Mr. Fuller – paragraphs [26] - [28], and [74].	N/A
(iii)	Establishes the appropriateness of a direct vehicle connection to Lower Styx Road from the PPC23 site.	Evidence of Mr. Fuller – paragraphs [49]-[53], and [75].	Planning Rebuttal evidence of Mr. Clease.

supermarket could trigger the need for an upgrade to the Spencerville Road one-lane bridge.

Mr. G. Smith and Mr. Fuller agree with Mr. D. Smith's analysis of the Sidra intersection modelling that questions the reliance on the 700 residential units as the threshold for triggering the intersection upgrades. As noted above, a 500-threshold trigger is considered appropriate and necessary to maintain the safety and efficiency of the intersection and associated network. This has been accepted by Mr. Clease in his Planning Rebuttal evidence.

The Transport JWS records the analysis of the CAST transport model prepared by QTP, with agreement reached that the concerns raised in Mr. G Smiths evidence cannot be resolved without the QTP modeller's contributing to the expert caucusing. Mr. Fuller and Mr. G. Smith support the findings of Mr. D. Smith's review of the CAST modelled traffic volumes along Marshland Road in the vicinity of the Turner Road and Spencerville Road intersections. I understand that any shortcomings with the CAST modelling have been factored into the recommended PPC23 ODP amendment outlined above.

Mr. D Smith and Mr. Fuller agree that a vehicle connection to Lower Styx Road is not required if there is suitable assessment of and mitigation provided for the Turners Road connection. This includes the intersection with Marshland Road. Mr. G. Smith maintains it is incumbent on the Proponent to establish that the primary connection to Lower Styx Road is not viable.

Mr. Clease's Planning Rebuttal evidence and Mr. Halls Summary Statement bring the viability of a direct road connection from the site to Lower Styx Road into question. This is due to the risk that the bridge and road connection would be inundated during a flooding event.

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
			I also agree with the evidence of Mr. Smith and Mr. Fuller that a road connection to Lower Styx Road is less viable than the primary connections from Turners Road and Spencerville Road. I consider that the mitigation proposed by Mr. Fuller and supported by Mr. D. Smith in the Transport JWS should be referenced on the PPC23 ODP. Which I understand include: 1. Upgrading the Marshland Road / Turners Road intersection when the 500 residential unit threshold is met. 2. Constructing a separate shared path between Teapes Road and the Ouruhia School. 3. Reclassifying and upgrading Turners Road to a Collector Road. 4. Widening the Turners Road carriageway to 6m plus 0.5m shoulders both side of the carriageway.
(iv)	Assesses whether the proposed interface treatments along the northern property boundary will impede sight distances for vehicles exiting the northern access point, and the need to vest this land as road reserve if required.	Evidence of Mr. Fuller – paragraph [76].	N/A
(v)	Includes a multi-modal accessibility assessment for the full PPC23 site consistent with Council ITA guidelines.	Evidence of Mr. Fuller – paragraphs [77] - [82].	N/A
			Mr. Fuller's EiC records his agreement with Mr. D. Smith that this is a relevant requirement that can be addressed at the time of subdivision. The Transport JWS does not evaluate this matter of concern. However, I agree that this is a matter that would typically be addressed through the subdivision process. Mr. Fuller's EiC includes a multimodal accessibility assessment. The Transport JWS does not evaluate this matter of concern. I consider that the accessibility improvements recommended by Ms Shröder and Mr D. Smith and recorded in the Section 42A Report are the “<i>minimum</i>”

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
			necessary to satisfy the NPS-UD Policy 1 (c) threshold test. I note that these ODP amendments have been supported by the Proponent. The Urban Design and Landscape JWS records disagreement between the experts on whether indicative connections or routes are illustrated on the ODP Plan, and a road connection from Teapes Road to the Lower Styx Road bridge is required, to improve internal accessibility.¹⁰ I am comfortable from a planning perspective that the Lower Styx Road connection is not viable based on Mr. Cleese's Planning Rebuttal evidence and the Transport JWS. I also support referencing the indicative connections on the PPC23 ODP but am not opposed to illustrating the routes recommended by Ms. Schröder should the Commissioner prefer this option.
e. <u>Natural hazard risks</u> – Infrastructure servicing report and geotechnical assessment that:			
(i) Includes supplementary geological engineering modelling that encompasses the slope that separates the upper and lower terraces, and how climate change and SLR may affect the groundwater levels.	Evidence of Mr. Trainor – paragraphs [60] - [61].	N/A	This concern has been addressed by Mr. Trainor, Mr. Charters and Dr. Dark's Geotechnical and Hydrological JWS.
(ii) Establishes how the future effects of elevated groundwater and SLR will be managed by the proposed stormwater facilities.	Evidence of Mr. Hall – paragraph [69].	N/A	This concern has been addressed by Mr. Hall and Mr. Norton's Stormwater and Flood JWS where they agree that the future 1 in 200-year storm event flood level to be applied to the site is RL2.88 New Zealand Vertical Datum 2016 that includes 1.2m SLR but excludes VLM.

¹⁰ PPC23 Whisper Creek JWS Urban Design and Landscape, 18 May 2026, para.23 & 24 pg.4&5.

s.42A Report (1.1.8)	Proponent evidence	Rebuttal evidence	CCC Planning reporting officer position
(iii) Provides a flood risk assessment prepared by a suitably qualify and experienced expert that accounts for Vertical Land Movement (VLM) and Relative Sea Level Rise (RSLR), which have not been modelled by Council and is required to satisfy the NPS-NH risk matrix assessment requirements. This assessment should also identify methods for protecting the stormwater management facilities from groundwater intrusion with consideration of the projected groundwater increases associated with Relative Sea level Rise (RSLR).	Evidence of Mr. Hall – paragraphs [59] - [65].	Planning Rebuttal evidence of Mr. Clease.	This concern has been addressed by Mr. Hall and Mr. Norton's Stormwater and Flood JWS. Although they are not VLM experts, they have relied on advice from Mr Ian Hamlin at GNS and Dr Jessie Kearse, a Research Fellow at Victoria University. Mr. Hall and Mr. Norton agree that the PPC23 ODP narrative, as amended by Mr. Clease, aligns with the agreed approach for ensuring the flood mitigation can be appropriately considered at the time of subdivision. Mr. Clease's Planning Rebuttal evidence provides a useful summary of the flood hazard mitigation following the caucusing of the stormwater and flooding experts for both Finished Floor Level's (FFL's) and the stormwater basin, which is required to be achieved based on the PPC23 ODP narrative.
(iv) Provides a tsunami risk assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced expert to establish the related risks and they can be effectively mitigated, which can supplement Council's Tsunami Study completed in 2019.	Evidence of Mr. Teear.	N/A	This concern has been addressed by Mr. Hall and Mr. Norton's Stormwater and Flood JWS. Although they are not experts in the flood effects of tsunami, they have relied on the advice from Mr. Teear.
(v) Includes an NPS-NH risk matrix assessment that is informed by the above assessments.	Evidence of Mr. Trainor – paragraphs [13], [41] - [44], Appendix A. Evidence of Andrew Hall – paragraphs [59 – 65]. Evidence of Mr. Teear - paragraphs [34 – 39].	Planning Rebuttal evidence of Mr. Clease.	This concern has been addressed by the NPS-NH risk matrix assessments contained in the evidence of Mr. Trainor, Mr. Hall and Mr. Teear and Mr. Hall and Mr. Norton's Stormwater and Flood JWS. Mr. Clease's Rebuttal Planning evidence records his acceptance of the expert findings in respect to the NPS-NH risk matrix assessment.

Appendix 2 – PPC23 ODP schedule of amendments

As a result of the evidence provided by the Applicant's discipline experts in response to the S42A report, some amendments to the District Plan provisions are recommended, utilising the S42A version as the base.

It is noted that the S42A report did not propose any amendments to the changes sought by PC23 to the Whisper Creek Specific Purpose Zone (Chapter 13 Specific Purpose Zone and Chapter 8 Subdivision) or to introduce the activity standard (new Chapter 8 activity standard 8.6.11) and area-specific permitted activity rule (new Chapter 14 area-specific permitted activity 14.4.3.1.1) to manage the Neighbourhood Centre.

The following lists the proposed ODP narrative in full. Amendments proposed by the Plan Change as notified are shown as underlined or text. Changes that were recommended in the S42A report and that are agreed are shown in **green**. Where the S42A amendments are not agreed, or where alternative wording is provided in response to the matters raised in the S42A report, these are shown in **blue**.

Where changes are substantive, they are accompanied by a brief 'comments box' to provide the rationale/origin of the change.

I have also recorded my track changes to the edits in **purple** with associated comments.

8.10 Appendices

Add a new Outline Development Plan and associated narrative as Appendix 8.10.31.

Amend the ODP plan to record the following recommended changes:

1. Provide pedestrian and cycle corridor connecting the site between Teapes Road and Ōuruhia School via Turners Road and to Spencerville via Spencerville Road.
2. Provide for a pedestrian and cycle corridor connecting the site to the intersection of Lower Styx Road and Spencerville Road.
3. Provide three additional pedestrian and cycle connections from the site to Turners Road and Spencerville Road from the proposed internal Collector Road near the Teapes Road intersection to the Pūharakekenui-Styx River riparian margin.
4. Provide for a more direct pedestrian and cycle connection from the amended location of the Neighbourhood Centre to the Neighbourhood Parks.

8.10.31.A CONTEXT

- a. This area to the north east of Christchurch lies to the north of the **Pūharakekenui**-Styx River, one of the primary natural features of Christchurch. Prior to European settlement, the extensive wetlands and easy access to the sea made the **Pūharakekenui**-Styx an important area for mahinga kai (food gathering) and for the cultivation and harvesting of flax. The **Pūharakekenui**-Styx River forms part of the southern and eastern boundary of the neighbourhood. Surrounding areas are utilised for a mix of larger farms and smaller rural lifestyle blocks. Chaney's Forest is to the north, Bottle Lake Forest and Spencerville are to the east, and the existing residential area and associated commercial centre of Prestons is located approximately 2km to the south.

8.10.31.B GUIDANCE

- a. Guidance on the means to achieve the development requirements and form and design elements is provided within the Christchurch City Council's Creating New Neighbourhood Design Guide.

8.10.31.C DEVELOPMENT FORM AND DESIGN

- a. The following design elements and features are relevant considerations in exercising control over the matters in 8.7.1 - 8.7.4 or the matters for discretion in 8.8. They are not requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) or Rule 14.12.2.16.
 1. The main features of this area will be the **Pūharakekenui**-Styx River and a large open space area located on a lower terrace between the residential development area and the river margins.
 2. ~~Where the RNN abuts or is opposite properties in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone larger section sizes are anticipated, with planting buffers and building setbacks along the area's external road edges with Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road.~~
 3. Higher densities are appropriately **located in** adjacent to **publicly accessible** open space areas and/or the proposed neighbourhood centre, and **key** active and public transport routes.
 4. ~~The total yield shall not exceed 800 households consistent with the available volume of potable water and capacity of the local pressure wastewater network that form part of the supporting infrastructure to service the site.~~
 5. Pedestrian and cycle links are to be provided to link the site to local schools, **Spencerville**, Prestons, Bottle Lake Forest, and along the **Pūharakekenui**-Styx River corridor.
 6. The character is that of an urban village set within a rural context, including the provision of a coherent **design layout including** landmark buildings and features, **centrally located publicly accessible open space, meaningful, while providing for a** diversity **of residential building scales, types and styles in site size, building typologies and height, which promote visual interest, choice and opportunity for home based business that serve the needs of the community.**
 7. The future subdivision design should incorporate outcomes that reflect the sensitive cultural and landscape values attributed to the area, including through the application of **Environmentally Sustainable Design, applied across the entirety of the site.**

8.10.31.D DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

- a. The development requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) and Rule 14.12.2.16 are described below and are shown on the accompanying plan.

1. INTEGRATION

- a. There are several landowners within this ODP area and a number of existing properties. Subdivision designs are to demonstrate good connectivity between different land ownership areas through road, open space, pedestrian and cycle links.
- b. The development is to provide new road access connections and shared paths to Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road. The development is to provide new shared paths to Teapes Road, Turners Road, ~~and~~ Spencerville Road **and Lower Styx Road.**
- c. **The total yield shall not exceed 800 households unless it can be demonstrated that there is a sufficient ~~consistent with the~~ available volume of potable water and capacity of the local pressure wastewater network that form part of the supporting infrastructure to service the site.**
- d. Where the **Residential New Neighbourhood Zone** abuts or is opposite properties in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone **and the Rural Waimakariri Zone**, larger section sizes ~~are anticipated~~ **required, including 60% of the lots with direct frontage to Turners Road and Spencerville Road to be a minimum of 1,000m²**, with planting buffers and building setbacks along **the area's external road edges** with Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road. **Minimum building heights of 5m, a minimum 3m internal building setback, and controls on the application of recessive colours and materials for residential units shall also be applied to the larger (1,000m²) lots where they front Turners Road and Spencerville Road.**
- e. Lots with frontage to Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road are not to obtain individual site access from these roads and shall instead obtain access from new internal roads **until such time as the rural land opposite the Site is rezoned for urban activities.** Open rural-style fencing is to be provided along these three external road frontages, with a **53m** deep landscape strip and a 10m deep building setback **(20m deep for any lots that are 1,000m² or larger).** **A minimum of two exotic trees that can grow to medium height (6 to 10m) are required per lot within the landscape strip.** Trees planted within the landscape strip are to be maintained. ~~It is anticipated that~~ **These outcomes will be delivered via consent notices on the titles.**

2. OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

- a. Retention of the lower terrace as a large open space area that can be utilised for a combination of pedestrian and cycle links, recreation, ecological restoration, stormwater management, and farming.
- b. Three neighbourhood parks **that are each approximately 3,000m² in size** are to be provided to ensure that most residential units are within 500m of a park where child play facilities can be located. Where appropriate, neighbourhood parks are to be co-located with stormwater basins. **At least one of these reserves is to be located on the upper terrace, within the north-western quadrant of the site.**
- c. A Neighbourhood Centre is to be provided, where it is accessible within the residential catchment via pedestrian paths, **is visible from at least one road that is exterior to the site,** provides a focal

point for the community, includes publicly accessible open space, and is viable. The Centre is to be commensurate with the role and function of a Neighbourhood Centre as set out in Policy 15.2.2.1 Tabel 12.1(E) and is to be no larger than 31,000m² GFA and excludes a supermarket.

- d. The land identified for the Neighbourhood Centre is to be subject to a consent notice that retains the land for commercial or community development for 10 years following the centre lots receiving s224(c) certificates. If no neighbourhood centre activities are developed within 10 years then the land can be utilised for residential development.
- e. Continuation of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River 'Source to Sea' reserve network along the river corridor.
- f. Where a pedestrian and cycle pathway is denoted, it shall be located within a corridor of a width that provides for unimpeded, safe and efficient movement of cyclists and pedestrians.
- g. Pedestrian and cycle pathways are to be provided along the eastern and western edges of the site to connect the Development Area with the Pūharakekenui-Styx River margins.
- h. Mid-block pedestrian and cycle pathways shall connect the Development Area to Turners Road and Spencerville Road.
- i. A pedestrian and cycle pathway shall be provided to connect the site to ŌŌuruhia Model School via the Styx Loop Conservation Park and a short section of Turners Road.
- j. Pedestrian and cycle links shall be provided to connect the site between Teapes Road and ŌŌuruhia Model School via Turners Road and to Spencerville via Spencerville Road.
- k. A pedestrian and cycle pathway shall connect the site via a bridge to Lower Styx Road and then to the intersection of Lower Styx Road and Te Korari Street at the northern entrance to Prestons. A pedestrian and cycle link to Bottle Lake Forest is also to be provided from this pathway.

3. ACCESS AND TRANSPORT

- a. A collector road ~~looping~~ through the site ~~to shall~~ provide an internal link between Turners Road and Spencerville Road. Collector roads within the site shall be designed to accommodate bus services.
- b. A fully interconnected local road network and active transport network across the site that achieves a high level of accessibility for people, including opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.
- c. Upgrades to the sealed width of Turners Road. Spencerville Road, and Teapes Road that include the following:
 - i. Upgrade of the Turners Road/ Marshland Road intersection to provide a left turn lane from Turners Road prior to the issue of section 224 (c) certificates for when more than 500 residential lots are created;
 - ii. Spencerville Road between Turners Road and Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 7.5m sealed carriageway;
 - iii. Turners Road from Spencerville Road to Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 6.0m wide carriageway with 0.5m sealed shoulders;

- iv. Teapes Road is to be upgraded to a 5.56m carriageway with 0.5m sealed shoulders and reclassification as a Collector Road;
- v. The Turners Road and Teapes Road transportation network upgrades shall include the squaring up of the intersection; and
- vi. Any land that is required to ensure the minimum sight lines are achieved as part of the Turners Road and Spencerville Road intersection upgrades to the east along Spencerville Road shall be vested in Council as public road.

- d. A Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment (LCSIA) shall be undertaken on the Spencerville Road level crossing to the west of the site that applies the relevant KiwiRail guidance. Any transportation network improvements identified in the LCSIA, including the installation of safety barrier arms, shall be completed prior to the issue of section 224 (c) certificates.
- e. Vehicles associated with the development of the site shall be limited from using Turners Road.

4. STORMWATER

- a. A sustainable stormwater management solution for the neighbourhood integrated with open space reserves.
- b. Enhancement of the habitat and ecological values of the Styx River and its margins in association with stormwater management and provision of reserves.
- c. Restoration, naturalisation and ecological enhancement of Spencerville Drain.
- d. The flood volume of the High Hazard Management Area will not be reduced.

5. WATER SUPPLY AND WASTEWATER

- a. ~~A water supply network and an associated new bore and water treatment plant and potential storage facility.~~ A groundwater abstraction and water treatment pump station, designed and constructed in accordance with an Infrastructure Provider Agreement that incorporates Council standards and requirements, supplying into a new water supply network integrated with the Brooklands-Kainga water supply zone.
- b. Sufficient water supply to meet fire-fighting requirements.
- c. A local pressure sewer network, discharging ~~to a rising trunk sewer to be laid along via a pressure main along~~ Spencerville Road, ~~over the existing bridge and then along into the~~ Lower Styx Road gravity sewer network, including odour treatment, corrosion protection and the upgrade of the ~~to pump station 78 at~~ Heyders Road Pumpstation (PC78), to be designed and constructed in accordance with an Infrastructure Provider Agreement incorporating Council standards and requirements in Spencerville.

6. STAGING

- a. There are no staging requirements beyond those relating to the provision of infrastructure.

7. NATURAL HAZARDS

- a. The land to the south of the Residential Development Area is subject to a high flood hazard risk. Activities within this area are subject to the provisions set out in Chapter 5.4.6. The area located between the Residential Development Area and Spencerville Drain is anticipated to be developed

as stormwater basins and recreational space. Land located in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone is to be for farming, wetlands, stormwater basins, and recreation.

- b. Any fill within the existing or future floodplain shall provide compensatory storage to:
 - i. Avoid the loss of live flood storage;
 - ii. Ensure that the development will not displace ponded flood waters onto adjacent properties; and
 - iii. Ensure the flood storage volume of the High Hazard Management Area is not reduced.
- c. The minimum land levels for new development shall apply:
 - i. The 1 in 200-year Max of Max flood predictions, which includes the highest series of pre-determined combinations of rainfall and tide Annual Return Interval.
 - ii. A 1.2m SLR (2.88m NZVD) plus any additional factor of VLM; and
 - iii. The finished floor levels for any new dwellings shall apply this peak water level plus 400mm of vertical freeboard.
- d. To allow for the safe egress and ingress of passenger vehicles in the event of an evacuation for flooding, tsunami or other natural disaster, all internal roading, including the intersections with Spencerville Road, Teapes Road and Turners Road, must be built up to a predicted flood depth that is no more than 150mm when measured at the kerb in a 1 in 50 year flood event.