

**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 18 Cashmere  
Fields/Hendersons to the Christchurch District Plan

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DAVID ANTHONY HATTAM, URBAN DESIGN, ON BEHALF  
OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

Dated: 1 September 2026

---

## **Plan Change 18**

### **Summary of Evidence – David Hattam**

This is a brief summary of my urban design evidence dated 30 July and the rebuttal evidence submitted by Bryan McGillan. My evidence is broken into four parts, the first of which is a Review of the Urban Design Report.

#### **Review of the Applicant's Urban Design Report**

I have read the Urban Design Report from Jade McFarlane of Elliot Sinclair. I consider that the report is comprehensive and I generally agree with the conclusions.

I consider that Mr McFarlane accurately describes the site and context. I would have liked a bit more detail on the condition of existing trees, but I do not think that this is essential to allow me to assess the application.

Under "Constraints and Opportunities" (para 15), I discuss the suitability of the site for development.

The site itself has urban development established or consented for over half of its boundary and much of it is zoned for residential development already. Of the wider Hendersons Basin area half the land is owned by Council and intended for stormwater reserves. This land is open, provides public access and is attractively landscaped.

The main issues are the interface with the residential boundary to the north and east, and the management of the interface between the housing and the stormwater basins and the remaining open area. This is a matter that occurs frequently in the Residential New Neighbourhood zone and is accounted for by the zoning and the Council's infrastructure design guide. It has been successfully managed at subdivision stage elsewhere and I expect it would be here as well.

Under land use (para 24), I comment that I agree with the proposed density identified, with 15 d/ha around the north and east boundaries. There is potential that high density housing would overlook existing housing at the boundaries and that residents would find this annoying, so placing higher densities more centrally, away from these boundaries, will reduce this potential.

However, I do note that the primary effect on neighbours relates to a change in the current environment (where they borrow amenity from an adjacent open space) rather than the establishment of an incompatible neighbouring land use. Either the existing ODP rules (placing larger sections at the boundary) or the setback suggested by the applicant, would manage this issue.

I discuss the future of the box drains (para 29). I understand that the central east-west drain is to be naturalised, in which case it would make a very positive contribution to the appearance and amenity of the site. I also understand that the north-south drain will be piped. My interest in this drain is more that it can be a safety issue if there is an easement required behind the houses, than any concern about piping.

Mr McFarlane describes how the new streets will create a connected network which will be seamlessly integrated into the existing neighbourhood. I largely agree with his conclusions in

this section. The combination of on-road and off-road paths shown on the ODP will contribute to a high amenity environment with a choice of routes and walking experiences.

### **New Neighbourhood Design Guide**

This document is non-statutory guidance but does provide a clear expression of what Council policy is trying to achieve. I consider the proposal is consistent with the guide and I comment briefly on this document in my evidence. A couple of the main points are:

Under “Creating a Sense of Place” (para 46) I note that the proposal would have a clear sense of place derived from the interface with the stormwater basins and channels. These reflect the natural and historical values of the drainage network (box-drains) and will provide a substantial recreational asset. It is beneficial that the basins are prominent and accessible from all directions, and provide for a linear connection.

Because the area lacks a centre, the denser development is most appropriate being focussed towards the stormwater management areas, which would certainly provide a high standard of amenity (para 48). I note this intention is expressed in the ODP and agree with the updates proposed by the applicant.

### **Discussion on the Proposed Residential New Neighbourhood Zoning and ODP Text**

RNN zoning was designed to allow for the subdivision of large areas of greenfield land for urban development. Alongside ODPs, it manages the particular issues that arise in these areas. These include supporting the future urban structure (for instance through connections and open space) and taking advantage of opportunities for amenity and sense of place (para 53).

Overall the use of RNN zoning contributes to a good-quality outcome and provides some certainty that the outcomes described in the ODP would be achieved. The RNN zone has been used for the development of greenfield land since the District Plan became operative and a number of new suburban areas have been established under this set of provisions. I therefore have confidence that it will lead to high-quality outcomes in relation to the new neighbourhood and external interfaces.

There are some particular rules around connectivity that are important, and a series of assessment matters listed under 8.8.9. These matters would reinforce the subdivision layout inferred by the ODP and are consistent with what is described in the application

I suggested a minor change to the existing ODP provisions which I found confusing in the light of the plan change (refer to para 64):

Amend the text at 8.10.18 C a.11 as follows:

*Higher density development, above 15 hh/ha is anticipated in Area 4a, particularly ~~at the eastern end and/or~~ adjacent to the stormwater basin.*

### **Comments on Submissions**

In my evidence I have commented on some of the submissions where these relate to urban design matters.

The most frequent issue was about the dominance of new housing and potential loss of privacy. In response to these points, I note that it is not unusual to develop RNN zoning in areas where it is next to existing Residential Suburban sites and RNN zoning is not an incompatible neighbour. Furthermore, the ODP provisions to distribute lower densities to the residential boundaries of the site will reduce the potential for effects on existing residents.

I have not recommended any changes in response to submissions.

## **Conclusions**

Having reviewed Mr MacFarlane's report, I am of the view that it is comprehensive and that I largely agree with it. In my report I listed a few minor issues.

Some of these were related to sufficiency of information. These were the tree planting issue I have mentioned, and the drainage issue, which I think has now been clarified.

Overall, I consider that RNN is an appropriate zoning for the proposal and would manage the impact on the adjoining open space, rural urban fringe, and the existing residential areas. I consider the management of density is appropriate, with measures to moderate its impact in relation to existing zoning being sufficient.