

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

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

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 to the Christchurch District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MIKAYAL JAYNE PARNWELL, PLANNING, ON
BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

Dated: 1 September 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My full name is Mikayla Jayne Parnwell. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief (**EiC**), and I reiterate that I have read and agreed 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 18 Cashmere Fields/Hendersons to the Operative Christchurch District Plan (**PPC18**). I have subsequently reviewed the Proponents evidence circulated on Friday 14 August 2026, the submitter evidence circulated on Friday 21 August 2026, and the rebuttal evidence by Mr. McGillan circulated 26 August 2026.
3. My summary statement addresses key matters that were raised during the first day's proceedings of the PC 18 hearing.

NPS - UD AND NPS - HPL MATTERS

4. As set out in my EiC, the district is likely to experience a shortfall in greenfield capacity within the next 10 years, resulting in a medium-term shortfall. Council is required to provide at least sufficient development capacity over the medium term to meet its obligations under Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. In this context of a medium-term shortfall, I consider the additional residential housing capacity enabled by PCC18 to represent significant development capacity predominantly because as it would contribute to addressing the anticipated shortfall. Accordingly, I consider the proposal assists Council in meeting its obligations under the NPS-UD while remaining consistent with the requirements of the NPS-HPL.
5. Yesterday, the question was raised as to the appropriate planning pathway if the additional development capacity enabled by the proposal is not considered significant. In considering this matter, I am guided by the way objectives, policies, and rules are intended to be read. Objectives tend to be broad and outcome-focused, with the policies that follow providing more specific direction as to how those outcomes are to be achieved. In this case, Objective 6 of the NPS-UD sets the overarching expectation that planning decisions will be responsive to proposals that enable urban development. Policy 8 then gives more specific effect to that objective by directing local authorities to be responsive in circumstances where a proposal would add significant development capacity and contribute to a

well-functioning urban environment. In my view, these provisions should be read together. Accordingly, if the proposal is not considered to provide significant development capacity and therefore does not meet the circumstances contemplated by Policy 8, I consider the CRPS Chapter 6 objectives and policies that seek to avoid development outside of Map A would become the more relevant policy direction for assessing the proposal.

NPS NEAREST EQUIVALENT

6. As per my EiC, I consider that the nearest equivalent to RuUF within the National Planning Standards is General Rural Zone or Rural Production zone. In considering the nearest equivalent zone to the Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUF), I consider the assessment should be based on the purpose, objectives, policies and anticipated outcomes of the operative Christchurch District Plan, rather than the existing land use characteristics of the land. As set out in my evidence, Chapter 17 establishes a common policy framework across the rural zones, with a clear emphasis on supporting rural productive activities, maintaining the character and amenity values of the rural environment, and retaining a distinction between urban and rural areas.
7. While the RuUF contains some unique provisions, the outcomes anticipated by the zone are principally rural in nature. In particular, Policy 17.2.2.24 recognises rural productive and recreation activities within the rural flat land surrounding Christchurch, while Policy 17.2.2.7 seeks to maintain the working function of the rural environment and avoid expectations of urbanisation or rural residential development. Further, although subdivision standards vary between rural zones, the underlying land use framework is largely consistent across Chapter 17 and supports productive rural uses and open rural character.
8. When these provisions are considered alongside the National Planning Standards zone descriptions, I consider the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone are the most appropriate comparator zones. Of those, General Rural provides the closest alignment with the operative District Plan framework, given the strong emphasis on primary production, rural-based activities, and maintaining the function and character of the rural environment. While Rural Lifestyle may have some relevance due to the smaller minimum lot size framework that applied within the RuUF, the strategic intent and anticipated outcomes of the RuUF are more closely

aligned with a productive rural environment than a predominantly residential lifestyle environment.

9. Accordingly, I consider that the nearest equivalent zone to the Rural Urban Fringe Zone is General Rural. This conclusion reflects the objectives, policies and anticipated outcomes of the operative District Plan as a whole, which indicate that the RuUF was fundamentally intended to operate as a rural zone characterised by productive land use and a clear distinction from the urban environment.

WATER SUPPLY ODP PROVISIONS

10. I rely on the evidence of Ms. McDonald. Her evidence demonstrates that development can be accommodated provided appropriate upgrades to water supply infrastructure are undertaken and wastewater capacity is managed appropriately. I have therefore recommended additional ODP provisions requiring water supply upgrades, wastewater capacity protections, and restrictions on development beyond identified servicing thresholds.
11. I have read the evidence by Ms. Bull and Mr. McGillan, and rebuttal by Mr. Mc. Gillan and appreciate their concerns regarding the prescriptiveness of the water supply provisions. However, I am still of the view that the potential adverse effect raised by Ms. McDonald is relevant and requires mitigation. Christchurch District Plan Policy 8.2.2.9 notes that an ODP must demonstrate that adequate infrastructure capacity will be available to service the intended population. Overall, it is my view that this potential effect requires mitigation. I proposed the amendments in Appendix 1 to my summary as a method to resolve Ms McDonald's and the request expert's concerns.

CONCLUSIONS

12. For those reasons, I continue to recommend that:
 - (a) Private Plan Change 18 be approved with the amendments recommended in my section 42A report and Appendix 1 of this summary statement; and
 - (b) Submissions be accepted, accepted in part, rejected, or rejected in part as set out in Appendix 3 of my section 42A report.

Date: 1 September 2026

Mikayla Jayne Parnwell

Appendix 1:

Proposed ODP Narrative Amendments

8.10.18.D DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

6. WATER AND WASTEWATER

- (d). No subdivision or development enabled by PPC18, beyond that already approved within Area 4A, specifically that area shown as Area 4C, shall occur until the necessary water supply network upgrades identified by Council have been designed, funded and delivered by the developer to the satisfaction of Council. █

At a minimum, except where refined hydraulic modelling demonstrates, to the satisfaction of Council, that a lesser extent of upgrades is required, the required water supply network upgrades include: █

- a. ~~Upgrade 307 metres of DN100 AC (installed 1957)~~ The water main in Leistrella Road between 26 Leistrella Road and the Hoon Hay Road water main. █
- b. ~~Upgrade 499 metres of DN100 CI (installed 1956)~~ The water main in Cashmere Road between Leistrella Road and the Hoon Hay Road water main. █
- c. ~~Upgrade 218 metres of DN100 AC (installed 1962)~~ The water main in Northaw and Rydall Street between 15 Northaw Street and the Sparks Road water main. █
- d. ~~Upgrade 256 metres of DN200 CI (installed 1957)~~ The water main in Sparks Road between the proposed new connection and the Hoon Hay Road water main. █
- e. ~~Upgrade these s~~ Sections of the vested DN180 PE100 water main in Leistrella Road that are as required to achieve the hydraulic performance standards identified in Council's hydraulic performance standards modelling assessment; and █
- f. Any additional works demonstrated through detailed design refined hydraulic modelling to be necessary to maintain Council's design standards, levels of service and network resilience. █