

**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

**STATEMENT OF PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF JOSEPHINE SCHRÖDER ON
BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

Dated: 10 April 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	7
Qualifications and Experience	8
Code of Conduct	9
Scope of Evidence	10
THE PROPOSAL AND ITS CONTEXT	10
URBAN DESIGN ASSESSMENT	12
Areas of Agreement	14
Areas of Disagreement	15
CONSISTENCY WITH THE POLICY FRAMEWORK	18
Policy Framework	19
APPROPRIATENESS OF THE METHODOLOGY APPLIED	29
REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS	33
CONCLUSION	36

Appendix i: Policy framework

Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My full name is Josephine (Josie) Frederika Jane Schröder. I am the Director/Urban Designer of Urban Opera NZ Ltd, an urban design consultancy.
2. I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**) in respect of urban design matters arising from the material provided and further information requests regarding Private Plan Change 23 Whisper Creek (**PPC23**) to the Christchurch District Plan (the **District Plan**).
3. In my evidence I have primarily responded to the Urban Design Assessment provided by Mr Compton-Moen and the various submitters to the PPC23. I have also drawn on the evidence of other discipline experts, acting on behalf of the Council, including Mr Smith, Ms Smetham and Mr Yeoman.
4. My evidence focuses on urban form and urban design outcomes of the proposal.
5. My evidence responds to whether, in respect to urban design and urban form outcomes, the:
 - (a) rezoning to the proposed Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (**RNNZ**) is appropriate.
 - (b) associated District Plan provisions, including the proposed Outline Development Plan (**ODP**), will be effective in the delivery of a well-connected urban area.
 - (c) the methodology applied to integrate the rezoning into the surrounding environment is appropriate.
 - (d) alternate relief sought by the submitters is appropriate and whether additional advice is required from the Applicant to ensure the rezoning is appropriate.

6. I have reviewed the Urban Design Assessment (**UDA**) of Dave Compton-Moen of DCM Urban Ltd prepared on behalf of the Applicant. I am not in full agreement with his appraisal of the proposal in respect to urban form and urban design outcomes.
7. The following are key areas of concern that I consider significant and need addressing regarding urban design and urban form outcomes of the proposal.
8. They are:
 - (a) The level of accessibility and quality of access for future residents in meeting their day-to-day needs, including access to services and facilities not provided within the settlement.
 - (b) Recognition of the context and character of the proposal as a standalone “urban village”¹ or alternatively “high amenity rural village”² within the ODP and associated narrative.
 - (c) The integration of the proposal within the existing environment, including interface treatments, as they relate to urban design. This includes the question as to whether the proposal will remain a standalone settlement or should be considered in the context of a future urban growth area.
 - (d) The level of connectivity provided within the proposed settlement, including the availability of pedestrian and cycle access, and visual and physical access to local reserves.
 - (e) The location identified for the village commercial centre and the likely viability of this centre.
9. I have the following recommendations:
 - (a) Inclusion in the ODP (*Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments*) of:

¹ 2nd RFI letter 06/08/2025 pg 9, 8.10.3X.C a. 6.

² Section 32, pg 11, 3.3 a.

- i. Additional cycle/pedestrian links within the proposed settlement, and associated greenspace links to external roads.
 - ii. Additional cycle/pedestrian connection to provide a more direct path from the neighbourhood centre to recreation routes, and a future direct connection to Spencerville.
 - iii. Relocation of one of the three required reserves in the north-west area of the upper terrace.
 - iv. Relocation of the neighbourhood centre.
 - v. Indicative future road link to Lower Styx Road.
- (b) Inclusion in the ODP narrative of:
- i. Staging which includes early provision of the land allocation for the neighbourhood centre.
 - ii. Amendment to more strongly support the village character - “the character is that of an urban village, including the provision of a **coherent layout** including landmark buildings and features, **centrally located publicly accessible open space**, ~~inclusion of the while providing for a~~ meaningful diversity **in site size, building typologies and height, which promote visual interest, choice and opportunity for home-based businesses that serve the needs of the community.** ~~of residential building scales, types and styles”.~~
 - iii. Provision of building typologies that include standalone housing, duplex, terrace and apartment typologies for whole-of-life housing choice and to promote diversity.
 - iv. Subdivision to be undertaken in accordance with Ngāi Tahu subdivision and development guidelines.

- v. Variation in building height (between one and two storey) and internal setbacks (to provide for a distance of at least 6m) between buildings fronting Spencerville Road and Turners Road.
- 10. I am unable to support the proposal in its current form in respect to achieving desirable urban form and urban design outcomes. I consider that the location of the proposal does not adequately meet accessibility requirements identified that are reflective of good urban design practice.
- 11. In addition, I do not consider that the settlement as proposed in PPC23 via the ODP and associated narrative will give effect to the principles of good urban design outlined in CRPS 6.3.2 including the effective integration with the existing environment and adequately addressing tūrangawaewae, amongst other urban form and design principles.

INTRODUCTION

12. My name is Josie Schröder. I am the Director/Urban Designer of Urban Opera NZ Ltd, an independent urban design consultancy based in Ōtautahi Christchurch. I have been a practicing urban designer for 25 years.
13. I have been engaged by the Council to prepare evidence in relation to urban form and urban design outcomes for PPC23.
14. In preparing this evidence I have:
 - (a) Reviewed the following documents:
 - i. Appendix F: Landscape Visual Impact Assessment prepared by David Compton-Moen of DCM Urban Ltd.
 - ii. Appendix G: Urban Design Assessment prepared by David Compton-Moen of DCM Urban Ltd.
 - iii. Appendix F (i): Graphic Attachment (Revision J) prepared by DCM Urban Ltd.
 - iv. Appendix K: Plan change text.
 - v. Appendix I: Preliminary cultural report.
 - vi. Urban design-related Request for Information (RFI) responses.
 - vii. Summary of submissions prepared by the Council and submissions pertinent to urban form and urban design outcomes.
 - (b) Undertaken two site visits, the latest being on 12 March 2026, accompanied by the Applicant.
15. This evidence should be read in conjunction with that of Nikki Smetham, Landscape Architect, David Smith, Transport Planner, and Rodney

Yeoman, Economist, all of whom are providing evidence on behalf of the Council, and whom I reference in my evidence.

16. I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

Qualifications and Experience

17. I have practiced as an urban designer for over 25 years in both the public sector and in private practice. Prior to my current role I was employed as Principal Advisor Urban Design at Christchurch City Council until March 2023, for approximately 12 years.
18. I hold the qualifications of a Master of Arts in Urban Design (Oxford Brookes University, UK), Bachelor of Planning (Hons, University of Auckland, NZ) and an Advanced Certificate in Landscape Design (Unitech, NZ).
19. I am a Registered Urban Designer (UDIA) and Deputy Chair of that Institute, a Registered Practitioner of Urban Design (UK) and a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I am a current member/chair of the Nelson/Tasman Urban Design Panel.
20. I have received accredited training in and have undertaken Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (**CPTED**) assessments.
21. My experience in reference to Private Plan Change 23 includes the provision of the following urban design expertise:
- (a) Urban strategies, policy and spatial plans on behalf of Christchurch City Council including to the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (**CRPS**) and specifically Policy 6.3.2.
 - (b) Christchurch City and District Plans, including the District Plan Review, and specifically residential and subdivision chapters, including the development of policy and provisions, and lead urban designer for the Council in developing the structure of the ODP's and providing guidance to their preparation.

- (c) The Christchurch Independent Hearings Panel (**IHP**) as an expert witness for the District Plan Review, on the residential, specific purpose and subdivision chapters.
- (d) The research and preparation for Plan Change 14, the Christchurch City Council response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (**NPSUD**), including the development of policy and provisions.
- (e) The preparation of Infrastructure Development Standards / Code of Practice to Tauranga City Council, Thames-Coromandel District Council and Christchurch City Council.
- (f) Large-scale greenfield residential and industrial development such as Northwood, Awatea, Halswell Commons, Prestons North, Milnes Park, in Ōtautahi Christchurch, and Wairakei, The Lakes and Tauriko in Tauranga Moana. This included pre application advice, assessment, and in many cases post-consenting implementation advice.
- (g) The preparation of context and visual assessments and urban design peer review, most recently for the Council and Waimakariri District Councils.
- (h) Preparation of design guides including oversight, industry engagement and review of the Creating New Neighbourhoods Design Guide for the Residential New Neighbourhoods Zone.

Code of Conduct

- 22. While this is a Council hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (contained in the 2023 Practice Note) and agree to comply with it. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

Scope of Evidence

23. I have been asked by the Council to address the following urban design matters in respect to the assessment of the Proposal:
- (a) The Proposal and its context.
 - (b) Review the UDA of Mr Compton-Moen of DCM Urban Ltd.
 - (c) Review the efficacy of the proposed ODP and the proposed provisions in achieving desirable urban form and urban design outcomes.
 - (d) Whether the methodology applied to integrate the rezoning into the surrounding environment is appropriate to deliver a well-connected and attractive urban area.
 - (e) Alternate relief sought by submitters in respect to urban design matters and the extent to which this may be appropriate.
24. I address each of these matters below. As is the nature of urban design, my evidence traverses that of several disciplines including landscape architecture, transport planning and economics. As such and as stated previously, I have drawn on the evidence of other discipline experts, acting on behalf of the Council, including Mr Smith, Ms Smetham and Mr Yeoman. The latter is in respect to the viability of the proposed commercial centre.

THE PROPOSAL AND ITS CONTEXT

25. The proposal and its context are described in the UDA of Mr Compton-Moen (pg 2, paras 2-3). I understand this to be correct. Further context is provided in Appendix F (i) – including a proximity map, context map and landscape assessment, also prepared by Mr Compton-Moen. I would anticipate however that an acceptable context and site analysis would also include matters such as:

- (a) Realistic distances rather than indicative distance circles to services and schools (time travelled/distance) given the importance of accessibility to this proposal
 - (b) Features of the area i.e. views to the Port Hills, character elements such as existing building styles within the area, natural values, landmarks and other references that contribute to character of the proposal.
 - (c) Site features such as topography, water features, existing buildings, stands of trees, views from the site etc to resolve the question of how the proposed development was structured, orientation of the pattern of development, why medium density development is appropriate to this location generally, not just the site identified as part of the graphic package etc.
26. All of these matters overlay and form a picture of the area, beyond just how aspects might be mitigated. Ms Smetham has further concluded in her evidence³ that the description of landscape context provided by Mr Compton-Moen is deficient (paraphrased) and identifies some of the shortcomings, including matters that contribute to the character and cultural context.
27. In addition, Appendix F (i) also contains the proposed rezoning, proposed ODP, indicative masterplan and indicative scheme plan. I reference Appendix F (i) in my evidence.
28. In summary, the proposal is for the rezoning of approximately 170ha of land from Rural Urban Fringe Zone (**RuUFZ**) and Specific Purpose (Golf Resort) Zone (**SPRZ**) to RNNZ.
29. The land (site) is in multiple ownership and is approximately 10km north of the Christchurch city centre. The rezoning is intended to enable a residential settlement of approximately 800 lots, a small commercial

³ Statement of Primary Evidence of Nicola Smetham pg 13, para 57

centre (up to 3,000m² or approx. 1000m² GFA), access, reserves and greenspace.

30. Throughout my evidence I refer to the proposed rezoning as a 'settlement'. I consider it is independent from existing suburban development at some 2.5km (as the crow flies), not a comfortable walking distance⁴, from the settlement's proposed neighbourhood centre to the northern extent of Prestons North, the closest suburb of Christchurch. Further the settlement is separated from Spencerville to the north-east by the Pūharakekenui/ Styx River and associated floodplain, with no direct access provided.
31. My evidence is based on the inclusion of the rezoning of all the properties identified⁵. I recognise that the four, approximate four hectare lots to the north of the settlement are not in the ownership of the Applicant. However, I consider these lots integral to achieving an appropriate and functional future development pattern, if rezoned to RNNZ.

URBAN DESIGN ASSESSMENT

32. I have reviewed the UDA of Mr Compton-Moen (Revision C). I have drawn on the UDA in respect to the existing site character (pg 2). I have considered the effects on urban design matters (pgs 2 and 3), including the table identifying the differences in zone provisions (pg 3), such as building setbacks and site sizes. I do not consider that the effects outlined are a full inventory, which I discuss further in this review, and in reference to the evidence of Ms Smetham.
33. I also reference Appendix F (i) regarding the methodology applied to integrate the proposed rezoning into the surrounding environment.
34. In respect to relevant objectives and policies, I have found the UDA of limited value to my review of PPC23 and the associated urban design matters. Mr Compton-Moen's evaluation primarily references the

⁴ Planning Officer's Section 42A Report pg 78 para 6.3.11

⁵ Appendix F (i) pg 8 Ownership Plan

indicative scheme plan, rather than the ODP, associated narrative and provisions proposed for PPC23.

35. I agree that indicative scheme plans can provide context and visualisation of possible options for development. However, in my experience scheme plans are generally modified, sometimes significantly, over the life of the concept development process, post plan change. Local examples include Prestons North, Northwood and Halswell Commons. Key elements of the proposals included concepts such as greenways, the location and size of the commercial centre, or the inclusion of apartment buildings and more intensive housing development. These aspects were not fully realised in the development outcomes of neighbourhoods to the extent anticipated.
36. I agree however with Mr Clease⁶ that more detailed aspects of a proposal that give effect to the principles of good urban design are often not enacted until the point of subdivision and building development, for example site orientation. I also agree that the District Plan rules and RNNZ design guidelines are central to ensuring good urban design outcomes.
37. However, as I discuss further in this evidence regarding the ODP and associated narrative, there is a balance needed that ensures sufficient guidance is provided at the outset within the ODP, narrative and provisions as part of the plan change to meet the intentions for the future development of an area.
38. In addition, while I agree with Mr Clease⁷ that the RNNZ rules should provide sufficient direction to the development of new neighbourhoods, the provisions were not developed or geared towards the delivery of village character in the context of a rural environment, as proposed. I also note that the RNN design guidelines are non-statutory.

⁶ 1st RFI Response 07/07/2025 pg 2

⁷ Ibid

Areas of Agreement

39. In respect to the UDA of Mr Compton-Moen, I generally agree with the following matters in respect to his assessment:
- (a) The context analysis provided in so far as it extends, noting that features both within and beyond the site, such as view shafts, have not been fully addressed in this analysis. I defer to Ms Smetham for detailed analysis in respect to the landscape context.
 - (b) That the proposed settlement is well-connected to the adjacent area by the existing road network, except for Lower Styx Road where a cycle/ pedestrian connection only is to be provided.
 - (c) There is a good level of recreation opportunity within the vicinity of the site. This includes potential connections to open space and for recreational cycling and walking.
 - (d) The proposed settlement is in proximity to Spencerville, albeit with indirect access (both existing and proposed) and is separated by Pūharakekenui/ Styx River and the floodplain.
 - (e) The site offers the opportunity to incorporate and support existing landscape features, greenspace and biodiversity outcomes, well-connected to the proposed residential use.
 - (f) Reserves will largely be within walking distance (400m) of residential development within the settlement.
 - (g) Within the SPRZ *“the proposal will introduce urban residential form to the proposal site, which will be markedly different from the current rural form that exists on the site”, and that “the rezoning will result in a higher intensity of development compared to the existing land use”* (Appendix G - Urban Design – pg 5).
 - (h) The SPRZ zoning indicates that the location is at least in part suitable to undergo development, and that *“residential development [proposed] notably differs from a golf course development”*. Mr

Freidel⁸ in his evidence considers the SPRZ is an urban zone. I have relied on this interpretation of the zone.

- (i) The summary of 'general distinctions anticipated' noted by Mr Compton-Moen (pg 5) in reference to the RuUFZ, SPRZ and RNNZ. These include variation in building setbacks, building height, site area and site coverage.
- (j) There are semi-rural settlements within Christchurch city's surrounds and more generally across Canterbury which are similar or smaller in size to that of the proposal. However, I consider they have characteristics that are not present in this proposal, which I discuss in further detail in this evidence.
- (k) The interface of the settlement could integrate within its location to a degree. While the interface treatment between the existing rural environment and the settlement, including the combination of a deeper building setback and proposed landscape planting strip will create a physical and perceptual barrier, there are opportunities to mitigate this to an extent. I note however that Ms Smetham in her evidence⁹ considers that the proposed mitigation is not sufficient to provide a suitable interface with the RuUFZ .

Areas of Disagreement

40. In my opinion Mr Compton-Moen has generally overstated the urban design benefits of the proposed settlement resulting from the rezoning to RNNZ, which he has based on the indicative scheme plan and masterplan, rather than the ODP and associated provisions. I also consider urban design matters have been conflated in Mr Compton-Moen's UDA, through his assessment of the NZ Urban Design Protocol 7 C's.

⁸Planning Officer's Section 42A Report pg 30 para 5.3.6

⁹ Statement of Primary Evidence of Nicola Smetham pg 35, para 146

41. I consider that:

- (a) The proposal does not appear consistent with prevailing urban development patterns within the Christchurch District as stated. In my opinion the prevailing pattern is the extension of existing suburbs and settlements rather than new pockets of development. The proposal is largely isolated by rural land and the Pūharakekenui / Styx River, rather than an extension of an existing urban area.
- (b) The change to a higher intensity of development as currently proposed is not appropriate. Accessibility and proximity have been overstated, and rather than creating a well-connected, walkable neighbourhood, the proposal will in effect be an isolated car-dependent dormitory suburb with limited access to day-to-day needs.
- (c) Further, with the proposed design response to the adjacent RuRFZ, the density of development to the interior of the settlement, to meet the 15hh/ha, will present as highly urbanised, within a rural context, unless innovative design solutions in respect to the provision of open space, landscape quality and building form and typology are applied.
- (d) I support Mr Smith's recommendation¹⁰ that a multi-modal integrated transport assessment is undertaken to further assess accessibility and connectivity, including any potential means of improving it such that it is acceptable. Potentially these means, in association with the additional connections and modifications recommended by Mr Smith¹¹, and those I have noted within my evidence, may alleviate or resolve these matters. However, at this time, I do not consider that as proposed a sufficient level of accessibility and connectivity will be achieved.
- (e) A small neighbourhood centre is proposed which is positive in respect to providing some local services, a focus and meeting place

¹⁰ Statement of Primary Evidence of David Smith pg 1, 5. (e)

¹¹ Ibid pg 2, 6.

for the settlement and contributing to a “village character”. However, the commercial and community offer will be limited, with the evidence of Mr Yeoman suggesting that 3-4 small shops and a preschool may be supported but questioning the viability of the scale of the centre as proposed¹². I consider a neighbourhood centre is vital to achieving a village character. Without it, and the additional design/functional elements I have discussed elsewhere in this evidence, I consider the proposal will be a subdivision rather than urban village, albeit with limited accessibility.

- (f) Reserves are located on the lower terrace only, limiting the ability to provide visual relief to the extent of proposed housing on the upper terrace. I consider this would assist in the integration with the surrounding existing rural environment, as well as providing amenity to residents and reinforcing a village character. I understand that Mr Barnes, the Council’s parks expert, considers the location and number of reserves adequate¹³. However, he also confirms that a change in location to that I have proposed (*Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments*) will not compromise the any parks planning provision matters.
- (g) Aside from the opportunities presented through the regeneration and development of the flood plain and Pūharakekenui/ Styx River, there is little to indicate how the proposal reflects and enhances the character and cultural values of the area. The context and landscape analysis did not identify elements such as character features beyond the site, for example the Port Hills, that might be utilised as structuring element of the proposal.
- (h) It is noted that this may be further developed at the subdivision stage. However, an indication of how this may be sought, beyond that currently provided by the proposed ODP text would be beneficial to address my concerns, those of Ms Smetham and those raised by

¹² Statement of Primary Evidence of Rodney Yeoman pg 23, para 90

¹³ Statement of Primary Evidence of Peter Barnes, pg 6, para 25

submitters in respect to character and culture. The preliminary cultural report¹⁴ recommends that “the subdivision is to be undertaken in accordance with Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines...”. I recommend that this reference be incorporated into the ODP narrative.

42. In summary I do not fully agree with the conclusions of Mr Compton-Moen in respect to achieving desirable urban form and urban design outcomes. These matters are discussed in more detail with reference to the policy framework and provisions. I have outlined recommended changes to address these matters where I consider they could be better resolved.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE POLICY FRAMEWORK

43. I have undertaken the following evaluation as to whether the proposed ODP, associated narrative and provisions are consistent with the policy framework. This is based on a review of the design intentions against core design principles to establish whether the former will be effective in achieving desirable urban form and urban design outcomes.
44. In undertaking this evaluation, I have drawn from the UDA of Mr Compton-Moen where relevant to the ODP and associated provisions, and the evidence of Mr Smith, Mr Yeoman and Ms Smetham where appropriate. I have addressed the urban design outcomes external to the settlement and those within the settlement.
45. I have relied on Appendix F (i) (Revision J) as the most up to date proposed ODP for the visual representation of the proposal, and PPC23 2nd RFI letter dated 6.08.2025 for the relevant District Plan text and narrative.

¹⁴ Appendix I – Cultural Preliminary Report 20/01/2022 pg 7

Policy Framework

46. The NPSUD Policy 1: states that *“Planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which are urban environments that, as a minimum: (c) **have good accessibility** (my bold) for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport”*.
47. The CRPS Policy 6.3.2 - Development form and urban design and the NZ Urban Design Protocol (2005) 7C’s, utilised by Mr Compton-Moen in his UDA, are very similar in nature in respect to the intended urban outcomes. The 7C’s were used as a basis for the principles of good urban design identified in Policy 6.3.2 but updated, and with more focus on land development outcomes rather than urban design process, as is included in the 7C’s.
48. I have utilised NPSUD Policy 1 (c) and Policy 6.3.2 principles (Appendix i of this evidence) of good urban design as key themes in respect to evaluating whether the ODP and associated provisions support desirable urban form and urban design outcomes.
49. Mr Compton-Moen has further responded to Chapter 14 RNNZ Objectives and Policies in his UDA. This response is primarily in reference to the indicative scheme plan. I have limited my evaluation to the ODP, associated narrative and provisions. However, I have referenced the indicative masterplan and scheme plan to illustrate matters related to the ODP and narrative.
50. In response to RFI matters, the ODP narrative¹⁵ has been amended to incorporate suggested recommendations to give greater effect to the outcomes of the ODP. These include matters related to tūrangawaewae, accessibility, connectivity and integration and safety:

¹⁵ Appendix K Plan Change Text updated 05/09/2025

- The response to provide for potential future land use change i.e. site size for future subdivision and to incorporate access (8.10.3X.C 2.).
- Inclusion of a reference to urban village (8.10.3X.C 6.) and (8.10.3X.D 6.) to the 'overall character' of the urban area'.
- Incorporation of a neighbourhood centre as a 'focal point' and its associated size, and which is accessible via pedestrian paths (8.10.3X.D c.).
- Aspects of design quality including safety in relation to pathways and their location (8.10.3X.D e.).
- Additional pedestrian/cycle connections (8.10.3X.D f. & g.).

51. I consider that these amendments are generally positive in being more explicit than previously proposed regarding urban design outcomes. I am supportive of their intent, while noting, as I discuss further in this evidence, that there are conflicts in outcomes sought.

52. Further, as discussed in more detail below, given the location and objectives of the proposal I consider further certainty is required than is currently provided through the ODP and narrative of what the proposal will deliver in respect to village character.

Tūrangawaewae

53. The proposition of the Applicant is that the settlement is an '*urban village*', albeit located within a rural context. A '*high amenity rural village*' has also been referenced¹⁶. I have considered what might constitute a village either urban or rural and whether the combination of the ODP and narrative provides sufficient guidance to deliver on this.

54. The narrative includes the following descriptor in reference to form and design "*the character is that of an urban village, including the provision of*

¹⁶ S32 pg 11, 3.3 a.

landmark features and a coherent design, while providing for a diversity of residential building scales, types and styles”.

55. Within the evidence of Mr Yeoman¹⁷ several settlements within the wider context of Christchurch have been referred to in response to the Application S32. Mr Friedel¹⁸ also notes the equivalency of 800hh/ha to that of Oxford or Diamond Harbour as examples.
56. In exploring the concept of a village in the Canterbury context, both urban and rural, and including Templeton and Tai Tapu, I have identified consistent traits that these settlements demonstrate for the most part. These include:
- Location at crossroads, or intersection of significance.
 - Provision of a variety of services to the hinterland or the surrounding neighbourhood.
 - Provision of housing and services for an associated industry / business / organisation within the vicinity.
 - A range of community activities and/or spaces that may include a combination of community hub, pub, playcentre, school, church or sports club.
 - Incorporation of open space within the residential cluster, and associated tree planting within the settlement.
 - Incremental growth over time leading to variation in lot and dwelling sizes and typologies, and opportunities for larger private open space and vegetation.
 - A relatively firm edge between the settlement boundary and rural surrounds (if in a rural context), with settlement that is not hidden from view of the wider area.

¹⁷ Statement of Primary Evidence of Rodney George Yeoman pgs 23-24

¹⁸ Planning Officer's Section 42A Report pg 32 para 5.3.14

57. My concern with the ODP and associated narrative as proposed is twofold. First, that the settlement will not realise the characteristics of a rural or urban village, but will rather result in effectively a contained subdivision, largely hidden from view that does not respond to its context.
58. A neighbourhood centre is indicated on the ODP and in the associated narrative which is positive. In discussion with Mr Smith, however, I recommend that the location identified in the ODP be reconsidered. As identified in *Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments* relocation of the neighbourhood centre to the intersection of the indicative collector roads would:
- Align the centre more closely with the highest level of traffic movement, including cycle and pedestrian activity.
 - Increase the visibility of the neighbourhood centre from the intersection with Turners Road to increase profile.
 - Remove the centre from the potential inside bend, which could make access more difficult.
 - Should development of the 4 x 4ha sites take longer to achieve, the relocation may provide an easier option to develop the centre.
 - Allow for more functional interfaces from a design perspective with adjacent land use (rather than potentially a stormwater facility).
59. The ODP narrative¹⁹ states that a neighbourhood centre is to be provided. However, there are no attributes as to what would be incorporated in the neighbourhood centre, for example publicly accessible open space, meeting opportunities, commercial activities or communal buildings and the like, given that the settlement is based on the ideology of a village. These are elements that are not discussed in any detail in the RNNZ design guidelines, which I now consider an omission. In addition, these

¹⁹ 2nd RFI Response Letter 06/08/2025 pg 10, 8.10.3X.D c.

matters are not included within the consenting framework guided by the NCZ.

60. I am concerned that should no neighbourhood centre, and associated amenities, be provided, the proposal will simply result in an isolated suburb, rather than a village context. In Christchurch, there have been several neighbourhood centres proposed, for example Northwood and Aidanfield, that are central to a new development, but that were not realised due to a lack of viability. The opportunity was then lost to housing.
61. No staging is provided as part of the ODP. I consider that early staging that incorporates allocation of land area to the neighbourhood centre is required, with a caveat on that land that it must be retained for the purposes of community activity for a given period i.e. 10 years, so as not to lose the opportunity for the centre. I consider this should be included within the ODP narrative.
62. I defer to the evidence of Mr Yeoman in respect to the viability of this approach, but without the neighbourhood centre, I consider this will further detract from the village character sought, and tūrangawaewae in respect to residents. I recommend that a staging plan be incorporated within the ODP and referenced in the narrative, that identifies the neighbourhood centre in the initial stages of the development, should the plan change be adopted.
63. The ODP (and indicative masterplan) identifies the settlement as one extensive area of residential development on the upper terrace, potentially uninterrupted except for the neighbourhood centre, a stormwater facility and streets. Reserves are allocated to the lower terrace adjacent to stormwater facilities.
64. This limits the opportunity on the upper terrace for play and passive recreation that is well-overlooked, is adjacent to residential units and forms part of the village atmosphere, providing a strong structuring element. In addition, this also limits characteristics such as clusters of tree

planting and open space that visually break up the built form within blocks and across the settlement.

65. Second, as I understand it, the upper terrace is intended to be raised in parts up to 1.5m to meet flood level requirements²⁰, resulting in a level platform generally higher than the surrounding area, with no apparent existing features retained. While I rely of the evidence of Ms Smetham regarding the visual impacts of this, what could result is a relatively characterless context as a starting point for urban development.
66. In my view the opportunity to incorporate aspects such changes in landform, large-scale tree planting, visible landmark buildings and variation in building height to provide a sense of place and character within an urban environment, rather than peripheral to it, become more important as a result.
67. The larger sections around the perimeter, incorporating planting, will provide amenity and soften the built form when viewed from adjacent roads. However, this response will also potentially reduce the level of interaction, physical and visual, between the settlement and surrounds, particularly if buildings are substantially set back. Potentially, this could lessen the sense of place created by the provision of an urban village in this location. This is something of a conundrum which I discuss in more detail in respect to the appropriateness of the methodology applied.
68. A requirement of the RNNZ 8.2.2.8 is meeting a minimum density of 15hh/ha. By having larger sections at the periphery, this potentially reduces the likelihood of substantive variation in lot sizes within the settlement. *“Perimeter lots are anticipated to be in the order of 600-700m², with the majority of internal lots around 450-500m² and short sections of terraces or other medium density typologies being around 200m²/unit”²¹.*

²⁰ On-site conversation with the Applicant of 12/03/2026

²¹ 1st RFI Response Letter 07/07/2025 pg 5,15. Housing yield

69. As noted previously, I consider the use of a transect (increasing densities towards the centre) could assist with integration and contribute to the village character. The approach could also promote more variation than that suggested in the application, which provides whole of life housing choice and for opportunities such as a large workshop for a home-based business. Again, these are apparent traits of small settlements.
70. The indicative masterplan shows some variation in lot sizes, within a very regular and relatively monotonous suburban pattern of development. However, variation in lot sizes is not translated into the ODP and narrative. There is reference to the location of higher density, but not to variation in density that would support the aspects noted above.
71. The indicative masterplan also signals a superlot of higher density, which in my view is more associated with a suburban or central city approach, rather than a village approach. Simply allocating a superlot for higher density, as you would find in suburban Christchurch, would appear to me less appropriate in a village context such as that proposed. In my opinion, further work is needed that is reflected in the ODP narrative to initiate a range of innovative solutions for variation in residential density, that are suitable to a village character. The use of a transect based approach to increasing densities and variation in building typology and height within the settlement, would be more appropriate in my view.

Accessibility, Integration and Connectivity

72. A key consideration of the NPSUD Policy 1 (c) is accessibility. Similarly, CRPS Policy 6.3.2 references integration and connectivity. All these principles are similar in their intent, albeit can be in reference to a variety of structuring elements within an urban growth area and applied at a range of scales.
73. Mr Compton-Moen²² considers that the proposed settlement is well-connected to the adjacent area by the existing road network. I agree, except that no road connection is provided to Lower Styx Road, with a

²² UDA Pg 8

cycle/ pedestrian connection only. I refer to the evidence of Mr Smith²³ in which he considers that a road link to Lower Styx Road should be further investigated.

74. I understand that from the evidence of Mr Smith that public transport is not currently available to the proposed settlement. That is not to say it won't be in the future. However, if not, noting limited density of population within the wider area, the lack of public transport reduces the opportunity to provide an adequate level of accessibility, particularly for those people who are unable to utilise other forms of transport i.e. sight impaired people for example. This results in an inequity in choice and opportunity in locating within this settlement.
75. The ODP identifies two additional cycle/pedestrian connections beyond the settlement. One to Ōuruhia Model School and the other to Prestons North. As with Mr Smith²⁴, I support their inclusion. However, I also consider further external connections are required to provide direct and safe access to Ōuruhia Model School and to Spencerville, referenced in the ODP.
76. The pedestrian/cycle connection to access Ōuruhia Model School is through a relatively remote and indirect path that links private greenspace and reserves, with limited surveillance. This in my opinion raises safety issues, particularly for children using this route for off-road access to the school. Mr Smith²⁵ has suggested an alternative off-road shared path along Turners Road (with good connections to it) which I support as a safer, more direct alternative.
77. Spencerville offers several services and community-based opportunities that could be utilised and/or contributed to by residents of the proposed settlement. These include a community hub, playcentre, fire station and home-based businesses, as well as the recreation opportunities in proximity to it, including Spencer Park. Conversely, the proposed

²³ Statement of Primary Evidence of David Smith pg 1 para 5.(c)

²⁴ Ibid pg 8 para 27.(b)

²⁵ Ibid

settlement has a neighbourhood centre identified, that may have a complimentary offering to residents of Spencerville.

78. Mr Smith has proposed an additional cycle/pedestrian path to Spencerville²⁶. I consider this would be of value to increase access, lessen the isolation of each of these communities, and strengthen community cohesion, should the proposed rezoning proceed.
79. Regarding accessibility within the proposed settlement, I believe further consideration should be given to incorporating several additional cycle/pedestrian links into the ODP and subsequent development should it be approved, to complement a well-connected street network.
80. As noted by Mr Smith, the link route to Ōuruhia Model School, whether used to commute or as a recreational route, does not have a direct link identified between the residential development area and that route. I consider this an omission in the ODP that should be identified to ensure future connectivity.
81. I acknowledge, and as noted by Mr Clease, that PPC23 would be followed by the development of a scheme plan, with the District Plan provisions and RNNZ design guidelines (non-statutory) used as a basis.
82. The (updated) ODP narrative identifies in text the inclusion of mid-block cycle connections. However, just as with road links, identifying important cycle/pedestrian connections on the ODP reinforces their importance in providing a functional and coherent structure.
83. I consider that a further three pedestrian/cycle links should be incorporated in the ODP (*Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments*). The first two indicative links are from the vicinity of the intersection of Turners and Spencerville Roads as noted in the narrative text. These are in combination with a greenspace connection where they intersect with the road reserve to maintain future access, but not provide cycle access to, until adequate facilities are constructed to connect to.

²⁶ Statement of Primary Evidence of David Smith pg 8 (a)

84. The benefit of the incorporation of these links in the ODP is three-fold. The first is to highlight the importance of future connectivity for pedestrian and cyclists within the settlement, that caters to all abilities/mobility, including to the neighbourhood centre.
85. Second, is to highlight the importance of future connectivity to the wider environment, and the opportunity that this presents. Mr Smith²⁷ identified that should the immediately surrounding area be urbanised in the future, then frontage upgrades are recommended to avoid development in isolated pockets and reflect an urban development pattern. I agree and consider these connections would ensure a well-connected urban environment more widely should land use change.
86. It is also proposed that, as part of the mitigation of the settlement and integration with the adjacent rural environment, that access be limited to Turners and Spencerville Roads, with boundary fencing, a 10m setback and a 5m landscape strip. This in effect could create a sense of a contained gated suburb rather than a well- integrated urban settlement. I consider that incorporating the greenspace connections/pedestrian cycle links would both provide structuring guides to future development of the settlement and assist with the integration of the settlement with the surrounding area by visually inviting connection to the settlement.
87. The third additional link is to serve as a more direct route to recreational activity. As currently identified the pedestrian/cycle links indicated on the ODP to the north-east follows the ownership boundary rather than following a desire line from the centre of the settlement and creating a more coherent route. A change in this route (*Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments*) could also provide for a direct connection to Spencerville in the future, as also noted in the evidence of Ms Smetham.

Additional Urban Form and Design Principles

88. CRPS Policy 6.3.2 identifies several additional design principles that are equally as important in application to the proposal including Safety

²⁷ Statement of Primary Evidence of David Smith pg 6, para 20

(CPTED), choice and diversity, environmentally sustainable design and creativity and innovation.

89. I have touched on safety and choice and diversity, as applicable to the ODP and narrative through the course of my evidence in relation to matters such as accessibility and discussion of village character.
90. Also contributing to character, but an aspect of environmentally sustainable design (**ESD**), is the use of low impact urban design. No mention is made of this in the ODP and narrative except in relation to a sustainable stormwater management solution (ODP 3.b) integrated with open space reserves.
91. I consider that both regarding ESD and creativity and innovation, it should be explicit in the ODP narrative that low impact urban design features are to be incorporated across the settlement to contribute to the character and environmental quality of the settlement. This would further integrate the settlement within its natural and rural environment. As discussed in reference to the incorporation of cultural elements, the Ngāi Tahu subdivision and development guidelines provide a comprehensive set of design matters and include ESD. I consider referencing development in accordance with these guidelines in the ODP narrative would ensure appropriate application through the development process.

APPROPRIATENESS OF THE METHODOLOGY APPLIED

92. Irrespective of whether the proposed settlement is appropriate to this location, I have considered the suitability, as requested by the Council, of the methodology applied to integrate the rezoning into the surrounding environment, to deliver a well-connected and attractive urban area.
93. It is noted that there is an overlap in proposals of this nature, between visual impacts in respect to landscape assessment and impacts and as they relate to urban design matters. Where a landscape assessment and may seek visual mitigation of a proposal, from an urban design perspective this may be considered counterproductive to establishing

good urban form and a viable settlement pattern. I discuss this in more detail later in this section.

94. As stated earlier I have adopted the evaluation of Mr Friedel that the SPRZ is an urban environment because of the residential and commercial development capacity already available because of the zoning. I recognise from the evidence of Ms Smetham that there is considerable difference in the visual impacts of the SPRZ and RNNZ as proposed.

Urban Form

95. In addition to the SPRZ, the proposal comprises a further four rural lifestyle lots of approximately 4 hectares each, to the north of the proposal, bounded by Turners and Spencerville Roads zoned RuUFZ. I consider that the incorporation of these blocks within the proposal, despite their current rural zoning, would assist to establish a more coherent urban form, and the opportunity for a more efficient and functional internal street and block pattern should the rezoning be approved. This is large part due to the shape of the block, and the potential level of internal connectivity, potential block orientation amongst other design matters.

Interfaces

96. I consider there is a conundrum with respect to managing an urban/rural interface that raises several questions, irrespective of submissions:
- i. Is it better to mitigate the proposed settlement to reduce the impact for residents of the existing rural environment, which has the potential to visually and physically isolate that settlement? Are there any other knock-on effects?
 - ii. Alternatively, should that settlement be incorporated as part of the new character and identity of the area?
 - iii. In addition, what happens if the rural area adjacent is rezoned urban in response to future growth pressure?

97. Each of these aspects has been touched on throughout my evidence in the discussion of urban form, tūrangawaewae and accessibility. In my review of village character traits, the settlements across Canterbury analysed were visible with physical interaction i.e. lots and houses fronting onto streets and roads opposite rural areas.
98. The proposal, as identified on the ODP and within the narrative, is to provide by way of a consent notice, a 10m building setback, 5m planting strip and open fencing to the rural boundary adjacent and across Turners and Spencerville Roads. An iteration to the ODP narrative 8.10.3X.C a.2. states *“that these sites shall be of a size that provide for future subdivision with potential vehicle access from these road edges”*.
99. It is my understanding that there is limited capacity for urban growth within this area currently due to infrastructure constraints. However, if overcome, and the area is considered appropriate for further urban growth this could change. As noted by Mr Clease²⁸ the purpose is not to provide a visual barrier but is to lessen the visual impact of suburban style density of residential development on the existing adjacent rural environment.
100. The proposal resulting would provide for larger sections on the periphery of the settlement, with more dense form into the interior of the settlement. In addition, the iteration in the ODP narrative for larger sites would provide future development opportunity to transition from a rural/urban interface to an urban environment in the future. This is not specifically stated in the ODP, but I consider should be for clarity if this approach is progressed. In addition, further subdivision should be in association with changes to the road environment discussed by Mr Smith, contingent on urban development to the west.
101. I consider from an urban design perspective that providing a vegetated setback (not a vegetated barrier), with open fencing, would result in an attractive edge to the settlement, with residential buildings still visible when viewed from adjacent roads and properties to the west and north,

²⁸ 1st RFI Response 07/07/2025 pg 2

and to some extent, visual interaction with the adjacent road environment, which is positive.

102. However, if large floorplates with minimal space between houses are to be developed, the resultant built form could read as a singular block and quite dense in form, particularly if 8m in height. Based on the indicative scheme, in effect a wall of development could be built along Spencerville and Turners Roads, rather than achieving a village character. Variation in the height of building, and setback distances between buildings could assist in managing this potential impact. I suggest this be incorporated within the ODP narrative. However, I defer to the evidence of Ms Smetham in respect to resolution of this aspect in relation to the rural interface.
103. In my opinion, physical interaction and activity between the settlement and its surrounds would be restricted by the limits to access and potentially continual fencing. In my review of village traits as previously noted, a good level of interaction between the settlements and surrounds were characteristic. My concern is that without further interventions, the proposed settlement will be perceived as an inward facing, 'gated' suburb, rather than contributing to the community more widely.
104. The additional pedestrian/cycle links as I have proposed be incorporated in the ODP if of a sufficient width and landscape quality, could both increase the level of visual and physical connection as well as provide visual breaks within the resultant built form. This would be in association with variation in building height, setback distances between buildings and tree planting within lots and the streets behind these lots. The density will still be in considerable contrast to the adjacent rural environment but in my view will be sufficiently integrated at the interface.
105. As discussed previously, I am concerned about the potential layout and density of development on the upper terrace, if no further open space is incorporated. As per the ODP, reserves and open space - with one exception, a stormwater facility- are located on the lower terrace, below the residential development of the upper terrace.

106. I understand that Mr Barnes, Council's Parks Advisor, in relation to levels of service requested the number of reserves was reduced from five to three, with these now located in the ODP on the lower terrace. As I have referred to previously in respect to village character, locating a reserve on the upper terrace within the residential development in the north-west area of the settlement could provide both visual relief and better integrate the proposal with the surrounding environment. This would also provide space for cluster tree planting and visual relief to housing development, as well as providing a higher level of amenity to residents within the immediate area. As such I have amended the ODP to incorporate a reserve in this area (*Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments*).
107. I defer to the evidence of Ms Smetham in respect to mitigation in respect to landscape values. However, currently I consider that without amendment the methodology will not achieve an appropriate interface with the adjacent environment, nor achieve a village character.
108. These amendments include: variation in building height and internal setback distances; retaining some visibility to the adjacent roads; open style rural fencing; providing additional pedestrian/cycle links and ensuring breaks in built form; provision of open space in the northwest area of the settlement; and incorporation of clusters of large-scale tree planting and street trees, that the proposal will not result in an appropriate interface.

REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS

109. I have reviewed the submissions in respect to PPC23 as they relate to urban form and urban design matters, extracting the key themes. I have not covered matters where they have been responded to by other subject experts engaged by the Council.
110. Several submissions support PPC23 in respect to aspects such as the opportunities provided by greenfield housing options in proximity to the

city, schooling and recreation activities. They also considered that the new development proposed would improve the quality of life and facilities available. One submitter stated positive urban design and community outcomes, amongst other benefits.

111. A submission in support of PPC23 also requests assurance of safe travel routes and connected street networks that enable access for parents and children to access Ōuruhia Model School efficiently. I consider this appropriate. With the additional pedestrian/cycle links I have proposed for the ODP and the recommendations of Mr Smith, and ensuring the provision of public transport is delivered, I consider that a well-connected road network will be achieved.
112. One submitter was neutral but sought the inclusion low impact urban design measures incorporated within the development proposal. I consider this appropriate to achieving environmentally sustainable design and support this inclusion in the ODP narrative, as discussed in my evidence in respect to the Ngāi Tahu development and subdivision guidelines.
113. Most of the submissions related to urban form and urban design matters are in opposition to PPC23 and seek that the proposed plan change is rejected. Almost all these submissions have not sought relief in relation to urban design or urban form matters.
114. The reasons cited in (loose) reference to urban design include:
 - Intensive urbanisation in contrast to the surrounding area.
 - Changes in character and amenity as the result of increased density.
 - Reduced building setback distances from those of the SPRZ.
 - Lack of continuity with existing urban areas.
 - No community facilities provided.

- Reduction in greenspace available.
- No design guidance for building.
- Urban design and urban form effects including unconsolidated urban form, lack of walkability.

115. I have addressed all these matters within the body of my evidence where they are within the scope of my expertise.
116. Several submissions sought relief through increased lot sizes ranging from 1000m² to 10,000m². I do not consider this appropriate to achieving the outcome of a high-quality urban village. In my opinion lots of this size would not be considered urban or suburban and are not effective in supporting a consolidated urban environment or the village character sought by the proposal, including the inclusion of a neighbourhood centre. I defer to Mr Yeoman in respect to the economic implications on the viability of the neighbourhood centre in association with any reduction in lot numbers and sizes.
117. Further, submitters have sought a retention of the 150 households incorporated in the SPRZ. I am unsure as to whether this was considered in respect to the layout of the SPRZ ODP, or if the proposition was for a residential cluster. If it is the former, the status quo would apply. I do not consider this appropriate to achieving the outcome of a high-quality urban village.
118. If it is the latter, a well-placed residential cluster on the site would provide a range of potential development outcomes, including the option to stage further development in the future, while retaining adjacent open space and generous setbacks in the interim. The Applicant may wish to advise as to whether they would consider a staged approach to the proposal in respect to developing building clusters of housing over time.
119. I note that while submitters noted the lack of building design guidelines as part of the proposal, in contrast to the SPRZ, no relief was sought by way

of recommendation from these submitters. However, this remains an option for inclusion.

CONCLUSION

120. I have reviewed the urban design assessment and other documents pertinent to urban form and urban design, including where matters relate to those of other discipline experts. I have considered the implications and impacts of PPC23. I have responded to the matters outlined by the Council and considered the submissions to the PPC23.
121. I do not agree with the UDA of Mr Compton Moen in respect to his conclusion that the proposal will not have any adverse effects from an urban design perspective. Overall, I do not consider that as proposed PPC23 will result in the desired urban form and urban design outcomes, for the following reasons:
- (a) The proposed settlement is largely isolated by rural land and the Pūharakekenui / Styx River, rather than an extension of an existing urban area, nor is in proximity to it. If developed as proposed, it would be an isolated settlement rather than a suburb in the current planning context.
 - (b) Accessibility and proximity have been overstated, and rather than creating a well-connected, walkable neighbourhood, the proposal will in effect be an isolated car-dependent dormitory suburb with limited access to day-to-day needs. Accessibility is limited, particularly for public transport and active transport modes, impacting upon choice and in delivering equitable urban places.
 - (c) The ODP, associated narrative and provisions as proposed will not satisfactorily deliver on the outcomes intended, including a high-quality village environment.

Appendix i: Policy Framework

National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020

2.1 Objectives

Objective 1: New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.

Objective 3: Regional policy statements and district plans enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply: the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.

Objective 3: Regional policy statements and district plans enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply:

- (a) the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities
- (b) the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport
- (c) there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.

Objective 8: New Zealand's urban environments: support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change.

2.2 Policies

Policy 1: Planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which are urban environments that, as a minimum:

- (a) have or enable a variety of homes that:
 - (i) meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and
 - (ii) enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms; and
- (b) have or enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors in terms of location and site size; and
- (c) have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport; and
- (d) support, and limit as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and development markets; and
- (e) support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and
- (f) are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.

Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013

6.3.2 Development form and urban design

Business development, residential development (including rural residential development) and the establishment of public space is to give effect to the principles of good urban design below, and those of the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005, to the extent appropriate to the context:

1. Tūrangawaewae – the sense of place and belonging – recognition and incorporation of the identity of the place, the context and the core elements that comprise the Through context and site analysis, the following elements should be used to reflect the appropriateness of the development to its location: landmarks and features, historic heritage, the character and quality of the existing built and natural environment, historic and cultural markers and local stories.

2. Integration – recognition of the need for well-integrated places, infrastructure, movement routes and networks, spaces, land uses and the natural and built environment. These elements should be overlaid to provide an appropriate form and pattern of use and development.
3. Connectivity – the provision of efficient and safe high quality, barrier free, multimodal connections within a development, to surrounding areas, and to local facilities and services, with emphasis at a local level placed on walking, cycling and public transport as more sustainable forms of
4. Safety – recognition and incorporation of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in the layout and design of developments, networks and spaces to ensure safe, comfortable and attractive places.
5. Choice and diversity – ensuring developments provide choice and diversity in their layout, built form, land use housing type and density, to adapt to the changing needs and circumstances of the population.
6. Environmentally sustainable design – ensuring that the process of design and development minimises water and resource use, restores ecosystems, safeguards mauri and maximises passive solar gain.
7. Creativity and innovation – supporting opportunities for exemplar approaches to infrastructure and urban form to lift the benchmark in the development of new urban areas in the Christchurch region.
8. This policy implements the following objectives: Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Appendix ii: Proposed ODP Amendments

