BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF	Clause 21 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991
AND	
IN THE MATTER OF	Proposed Private Plan Change 23 (Whisper Creek), being a request by LLM Investments Limited (Applicant) to rezone land from Special Purpose Golf Resort Zone (SPRZ) and Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUFZ) portions of the site to Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNNZ) and Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUFZ) at 144, 156 and 176 Turners Road and 174, 220 and 240 Spencerville Road and 161 Lower Styx Road.

RECOMMENDATION OF COMMISSIONER GRAHAM TAYLOR

Dated 18 November 2026

Hearing Held: 20, 21 and 22 May 2026

Appearances:

Applicant:

Ms Jo Appleyard – Legal Counsel

Ms Tallulah Parker – Assistant Counsel

Mr Ross Moffatt – Company Representative

Mr Fraser Colegrave – Economics

Mr Chris Jones – Market (did not appear)

Mr Nick Fuller Transport

Mr Mark Trainor – Geotech

Mr Gary Teear - Coastal Hazards

Dr Jesse Kearse - Vertical Land Movement (via AV link)

Mr Andrew Dark – Hydrology

Mr Andrew Hall – Infrastructure Three Waters and Flooding

Mr Christpher Mongillo – Contaminated Land

Ms Annabele Coates – Ecology

Mr David Compton-Moen – Landscape and Urban Design

Mr Jonathan Clease – Planning

Council:

Mr Craig Friedel – Consultant Planner

Mr Rodney Yeoman – Economics

Mr Brian Norton – Stormwater and Flooding

Ms Michele McDonald – Water Supply and Wastewater

Mr David Smith – Consultant Transportation Planner

Ms Josephine Schröder – Consultant Urban Design

Ms Nicola Smetham, Consultant Landscape Architect

Submitters

Gabrielle Wall – Submitter 59

David Elkington – Submitter 22

Jan Therese Burney – Submitter 47

David Parker – Submitter 28

Gail Lowe – Submitter 51

Spencerville Residents Association (**SRA**) - Vivian Knight – Submitter 14

Rowena Watson – Submitter 4

Deanna Riwaka – Submitter 20

Kim Melony Foot - Submitter 11

Danny Knight presenting for Craig Wakelin, Jenny Knight, Murray Wakelin Family Trust – Submitters 26, 42, 45, 55

John Messerly – Submitter 75

Mel Pierce – Submitter 9

Conrad Ling presenting for Debbie Ling and Heidi King – Submitters 34, 36

Tammy Wells, video presentation for Tammy Wells and Michael Wells – Submitters 73, 74

Lyndia Maurice presenting for Lyndia Maurice, Karen and Ross Winter – Submitters 53, 68

Kristen and Andrew Buxton – Submitter 71

Ouruhia Residents Group (**ORG)** – George Nimmo – Submitter 70

Ms Anna Carter – Consultant Planner for Ouruhia Residents Group

Mr Grant Smith – Consultant Transport Planner for Ouruhia Residents Group

ABBREVIATIONS TABLE

CCC	Christchurch City Council
CDP	Operative Christchurch District Plan
CLWRP	Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
CRC	Canterbury Regional Council / Environment Canterbury
CRPS	Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
GCSP	Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan
JWS	Joint Witness Statement
LCISA	Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment
LUC	Land Use Capability
MfE	Ministry for the Environment
RNNZ	Residential New Neighbourhood Zone
SPRZ	Special Purpose Golf Resort Zone
RuUFZ	Rural Urban Fringe Zone
OSWM	Open Space Waterways and Margins Zone
NES-CS	National Environmental Standard - Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement – Urban Development
NPS-FW	National Policy Statement – Freshwater Management
NPS-I	National Policy Statement - Infrastructure
NPS-NH	National Policy Statement – Natural Hazards
NPS-HPL	National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land
ODP	Outline Development Plan
PC23	Private Plan Change 23
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
CCC	Christchurch City Council

CONTENTS

Introduction **6**
PC23 – Whisper Creek Plan Change **6**
The Site and Surrounding Environment **7**
Statutory Framework **8**
Assessment of Key Matters Raised in Submissions **9**
Environmental Baseline 9
Due process and technical assessments 10
Urban Form 11
Housing and Business Sufficiency and Development Feasibility 14
Character, Amenity and Visual Effects 17
Infrastructure, Land Development and Nuisance effects 20
Wastewater 20
Water Supply 21
Stormwater 22
Utilities 23
Neighbourhood Parks 24
Land Development and Nuisance Effects 24
Community Facilities 25
Transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility 25
Commercial Centre 26
Primary Access to Development (Turners Rd vs Lower Styx Road) 27
Spencerville Road - LCSIA 28
Spencerville Road Cross Section 28
Construction Traffic 28
Traffic Modelling 29
Traffic modelling – Intersection Modelling 29
Human Health and Natural Hazard risks 30
Reverse sensitivity 31
Natural, Cultural and Historic Sites and Values 32
Natural Values 32
Cultural and Historic Values 33
Property And Social Wellbeing 33
Statutory Evaluation **34**
Actual Or Potential Effects on the Environment 34
Relevant Planning Documents 35
National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) 35
National Policy Statement on Natural Hazards (NPS-NH) 36
National Policy Statement for Infrastructure (NPS-I) 36
National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) 36
National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (NPS-FWM) 36
Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) 36
Christchurch District Plan 37
Part 2 RMA 37
Section 32AA Evaluation 38
Overall Conclusions **39**
Recommendations **39**

Introduction

1. I have been appointed by the Christchurch City Council to hear submissions and make recommendations on Private Plan Change 23 – Whisper Creek (**PC23**) to the Christchurch District Plan (**CDP**).

2. PC23 seeks to rezone approximately 170 hectares of land located in North East Christchurch from Special Purpose Golf Resort Zone (SPRZ) and Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUFZ) portions of the site to a Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNNZ) with an anticipated yield of 800 households and a neighbourhood centre, rezone a portion of a lower terrace that is currently zoned SPRZ to RuRFZ, retain the current Open Space Waterway and Margins Zone (OWMZ) along the Pūharakekenui-Styx River margins, and associated deletions and amendments to CDP rules and Outline Development Plan (**ODP**) provisions.

3. A hearing on PC23 was held in Christchurch on 20 – 22 May 2026. Following the hearing adjournment, I issued Minute 4 including a timetable and directions for further inputs including planner caucusing and the applicant's written reply. The actions identified in the minute have been completed and provided to me, and I received the applicant's written reply on 16 June 2026. The hearing was formally closed on 22 June 2026.

4. I am familiar with the site and surrounding locality and undertook a site visit on 9 April 2026.

5. I have not included a specific summary of all of the documents considered, evidence provided and submissions made. All of that information is publicly available and has been uploaded to the Council's plan change site at https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/plans-strategies-policies-and-bylaws/plans/christchurch-district-plan/changes-to-the-district-plan/private-plan-changes/pc23.

6. I have referred to the relevant evidence, submissions and other documents, when addressing the particular issues and statutory provisions. I have considered all of the relevant documents, evidence and submissions.

PC23 – Whisper Creek Plan Change

7. Private Plan Change application PC23 was lodged by LLM Investments 2012 Limited on 17 May 2025. Following requests for information, the plan change was accepted for notification pursuant to clause 25 of Schedule 1 on 23 September 2025 and publicly notified on 17 October 2025. Submissions closed on 17 November 2025, and further submissions closed on 23 January 2026. 74 original submissions and three further submissions were received. One submission was subsequently withdrawn. The submissions are summarised in the s42A report of Mr Friedel and I have not repeated that detail here.

8. PC23 relates to approximately 170 hectares of land located at 144, 156 and 176 Turners Road and 174, 220 and 240 Spencerville Road and 161 Lower Styx Road. The proposal includes:

    - Rezoning the operative Special Purpose Golf Resort Zone (SPRZ) and Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUFZ) portions of the site to a Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNNZ) with

an anticipated yield of 800 households (**hh**) and including a neighbourhood centre with up to 3000m^2 GFA.

- Rezoning a portion of the lower terrace that is currently subject to the SPRZ to RuUFZ to enable rural activities to continue.
- Applying the Qualifying Matters overlay in response to the infrastructure servicing and flood hazard constraints that will enable the RNNZ minimum housing densities of 15 households per hectare (hh/ha) to be applied to any future subdivision.
- Retaining the current Open Space Waterway and Margins Zone (OWMZ) to the balance of the site that includes the lower terrace and Pūharakekenui-Styx River margins.
- Deleting the Whisper Creek SPRZ references to the site and associated rules and Outline Development Plan (ODP) in the Specific Purpose (Golf Resort) Chapter 13.9 and Subdivision Chapter 8 of the CDP.
- Adding an ODP as an Appendix to Chapter 8 – Subdivision.
- Including a new activity standard 8.6.11 and permitted activity rule 14.4.3.1.1 to apply the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ) provisions to manage the proposed Neighbourhood Centre.

9. With the exception of four RuUF zoned lifestyle block properties in the north-western corner of the site, the majority of the site is subject to SPRZ zoning established through Private Plan Change 45 (PC 45) in 2010 to enable the development of an integrated golf resort. The SPRZ provisions and ODP provide for an 18-hole golf course, 380-bedroom hotel and serviced apartments, 160- bedroom golf academy, and 150 residential units, with the built elements established on the higher, northern terrace. Access to the development under the ODP would be from a bridge crossing the Pūharakekenui-Styx River from Spencerville Road.

10. The golf resort has not proceeded and is now considered by the applicant to be non-viable. This application for rezoning has been predicated on the basis that the present CDP zoning anticipates a substantial level of development at an intensity and character typically associated with an urban environment, albeit in a resort-based format of urban activity under the present zoning. The applicant's position is that the land is already zoned for urban activity, therefore the proposal represents an intensification rather than a new urban area.

The Site and Surrounding Environment

11. The s32 evaluation accompanying the application provided a full description of the PC23 site and surrounds. The s42A report of Mr Friedel also provided a summary description of the site and surrounding environment. I accept the descriptions provided are accurate and adopt them for the purposes of this recommendation.

12. The site has frontage to Spencerville, Turners, and Teapes Roads, and also has access to Lower Styx Road via a private bridge. It is currently in use as a pastoral farm and lifestyle

blocks.

13. The Site is divided into an upper and lower terrace. The upper terrace is approximately 64ha in area and sits approximately 2m higher than the lower terrace. It fronts Spencerville, Turners, and Teapes Roads.

14. The 'lower terrace' is approximately 106ha that is to be retained as a mix of stormwater basins, farmland, and ecological restoration.

Statutory Framework

15. The statutory framework for consideration of PC23 are set out in section 4 of Mr Friedel's s42A report and were agreed with in the evidence of Mr Cleese.

16. In brief, the general requirements include to test whether the proposed changes to the CDP will continue to:

- "Accord with" and assist the Council to carry out its functions to prepare, implement and review its district plan (section 74 (1)(a) and section 31).
- "Accord with" the RMA Part 2 Purpose and Principles (section 74 (1)(b)).
- "Accord with" relevant national policy statements, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, the national planning standards and regulations (section 74 (1) (ea) and (f)).
- "Give effect" to any national policy statement, national planning standard or operative regional policy statement (section 75 (3)) or be inconsistent with a water conservation order or regional plan (section 75 (4)).
- Examine the extent to which the objectives of PC23 are the "most appropriate way" to achieve the RMA Purpose (section 32 (1)(a)).
- Examine whether the provisions are the "most appropriate way" to achieve the objectives of the CDP and the PPC23 purpose (section 32 (1)(b)).

17. Section 32 requires that:

(a) Each proposed policy or method (including each rule) is to be examined, having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, as to whether it is the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the district plan taking into account the benefits and costs of the proposed policies and methods, and the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information.

(b) If a National Environmental Standard applies, and the proposed rule imposes a greater prohibition or restriction than that, then whether the greater prohibition or restriction is justified in the circumstances.

(c) The objectives of the proposal (here the stated purpose of the proposal) are to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

(d) The provisions in PC23 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the

CDP and the purpose of the proposal.

Assessment of Key Matters Raised in Submissions

18. A comprehensive table summarising submission points and relief sought by submitters was contained in Appendix 4 of Mr Friedel's report.

19. Mr Friedel's s42A report identified the key matters either raised by submitters, or necessary to be considered in ensuring that CCC's statutory functions and responsibilities are fulfilled as:

- Due process and technical assessments.
- Urban form.
- Housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility.
- Character, amenity and visual effects.
- Infrastructure and land development effects, including 3Waters, utilities, neighbourhood Parks, earthworks and nuisance effects and community facilities.
- Transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility.
- Human health and natural hazard risks.
- Reverse sensitivity.
- Natural, cultural and historic sites and values.
- Property and social wellbeing.

20. I largely adopt those headings. The following assessments evaluate the matters raised in the submitter points under issues headings. The resultant recommendations on specific submissions are contained in the submission table attached as **Appendix Two.**

Environmental Baseline

21. I have considered what is the appropriate environmental baseline against which effects should be considered. The subject land is presently predominantly used for grazing stock and has a mostly open rural appearance and character.

22. The rural area to the west of the site on Turners Road contains several rural dwellings on small sites of between 2ha - 4ha in area, as well as some larger holdings, typical of the RuUF zone. There are larger farm properties located to the north on Spencerville Road.

23. I heard from several submitters who reside nearby, who place high value on the present rural character and amenity values that they experience.

24. However, I must also consider the present SPRZ zoning of the site, and the type of development and environment that is anticipated through that zoning. There is a legitimate expectation that nearby residents may experience such development and resultant effects to occur.

25. The SPRZ zone provides for an 18-hole golf course, 380-bedroom hotel serviced apartments, 160 - bedroom golf academy, and 150 residential units located on the northern terrace. It also

includes commercial activities. Both Mr Friedel and Mr Cleese agreed that the overall development density is equivalent to around 300 – 400 dwellings located on the upper terrace. In this respect, the proposal is considered to represent an intensification of the approved site development, rather than a new greenfield development of rural land.

26. I agree that the effects of potential SPRZ development of the land provide an appropriate baseline against which PC23 should be considered, rather than comparing it to the present rural use and environment. There are of course several key differences between the PC23 proposal and the anticipated SPRZ development that require consideration. These include but are not limited to increased density, access and vehicle generation from Turners Road rather than Lower Styx Road, reduced setback and resultant visual impact on Turners Road properties, increased servicing demand, earthworks and stormwater impacts, and inclusion of four RuUF zoned properties.

27. I also agree with the evidence of Mr Cleese and Mr Friedel that the existing SPRZ zone provides for a golf resort and residential development that are defined as urban activities for the purpose of Chapter 6 of the CRPS. Whilst the SPRZ land is not included in Map A of the CRPS, I agree that the present zoning means that the proposal in respect of that land does not represent unanticipated or out of sequence development to which policy 8 of the NPS-UD would apply. Policy 8 does however apply to the four RuUF zoned land parcels.

Due process and technical assessments

28. Fourteen submissions raised issues concerning the adequacy of due process and technical assessments. These included whether the Spencerville Residents Association (**SRA**) represents the community, adequacy of consultation, and whether adequate technical assessment and peer review of PC23 had been undertaken.

29. Submissions have been lodged by both the SRA and by individual members of the community. They raise several different issues. I agree with Mr Friedel that under the RMA any person may submit on a private plan change request. The SRA comprises a body of persons who may submit therefore has status as a submitter. I must consider all submissions according to their merits and acknowledge that the SRA, as with any community group, will not necessarily represent the views of all persons in the local community. Accordingly, I recommend that those submissions that question the status of the SRA be **rejected**.

30. The RMA does not include a statutory obligation for a private plan change proponent to consult with landowners or mana whenua. The submission and further submission processes provide the opportunity for public input. Accordingly, I recommend that submissions and further submissions opposing PC23 due to lack of consultation be **rejected**.

31. I note that the s42A report of Mr Friedel identified several issues where he considered that further expert assessment was required, and that significant additional information was provided by the applicant in evidence and at the hearing that addressed these issues. Some submitters also raised concerns with the adequacy of assessment, particularly in regard to the performance and condition of the wastewater network at Spencerville, stormwater and flooding issues, and transport assessments. I was presented with comprehensive evidence on these matters by

various parties at the hearing.

32. Having regard to the evidence submitted and presented at the hearing, I am satisfied that adequate technical evidence has been provided in order to make properly informed recommendations on all issues relevant to consideration of the plan change under the RMA. I therefore recommend that submissions that sought that additional assessment be provided be **accepted** or **accepted in part** insofar as they relate to relevant RMA considerations. As noted by Mr Friedel in his report, some submitters sought additional assessment of matters that are not considered necessary for the purpose of evaluating the appropriateness of the rezoning. I agree with his assessment and recommend that those submissions be **rejected** insofar as they relate to non-relevant issues**.**

Urban Form

33. Nine (9) submission points relate to urban form. These were summarised by Mr Friedel as:

    (a) Support for PPC23 as the location and site context contributes to an appropriate urban form, including because the site isn't highly productive land, the development can be effectively coordinated through an ODP and consistency with strategic planning documents.

    (b) Opposing PPC23 as the rezoning does not represent a "well-functioning urban environment" and is consequently considered to be urban sprawl that is inconsistent with relevant urban growth policies in the CRPS, the CDP SPRZ rules and national directions on urban development and freshwater management. Submission points identify that the rezoning will contribute to a loss of highly productive land and create a precedent for similar rezonings elsewhere in Ōtautahi Christchurch.

    (c) Holding a neutral position but highlight the risks and issues with "out of sequence" development that can lead to poor urban form, higher infrastructure costs, poor environmental outcomes, and greater exposure to natural hazards

34. I heard expert planning evidence on these matters from Mr Clease and Mr Friedel for the applicant and Council respectively, as well as from Ms Carter for the ORG. Urban Form issues were also addressed in the Urban Design evidence of Mr Compton-Moen and Ms Schröder.

35. As detailed in my previous section, whilst the land is presently undeveloped and rural in character, it is necessary to consider the anticipated environment that may exist under the SPRZ provisions.

36. Both Mr Clease and Mr Friedel agreed that although the site is not shown as a Greenfield Priority Area on Map A of the CPRS, the activities authorised under the SPRZ are an *Urban Activity* as defined in the CRPS. Ms Carter also agreed that the SPRZ provides for residential units as urban activities under the CRPS definition but considered that the activities associated with the golf course being the resort accommodation (provided within an apartment complex), the conference facilities, retail areas and sports complex sit outside the definition of 'urban' as provided for under the CRPS. Given the exclusion of the site from Map A, and with reference to

the Commissioner's decision on PC45, she considered that the site is not within an urban area.

37. The CRPS definition of Urban Activity applicable to Greater Christchurch reads:

- *means activities of a size, function, intensity or character typical of those in urban areas and includes:*
- *Residential units (except rural residential activities) at a density of more than one household unit per 4 ha of site area;*
- *Business activities, except those that fall within the definition of rural activities;*
- *Sports fields and recreation facilities that service the urban population (but excluding activities that require a rural location);*
- *Any other land use that is to be located within the existing urban area or new Greenfield Priority Area or Future Development Area.*

38. The SPRZ provides for up to 150 residential units, as well as 380 serviced apartments and a 160 bedroom golf academy. The apartments and golf academy rooms are defined as a Resort Hotel under the CDP and are excluded from the definition of residential activity. However, they are activities that are "*of a size, function, intensity or character typical of those in urban areas."*

39. The golf resort would contain business activities that do not fall within the definition of rural activities, and the golf course is a recreation facility that would serve an urban population and does not *"require"* a rural location.

40. For these reasons I find that the range of activities provided for in the SPRZ fall within those described by the first four bullet points of the CRPS definition. I find that the existing SRPZ provides for urban activities and is an *existing urban area* for the purpose of the CRPS Chapter 6 provisions, including Objective 6.2.1 and Policy 6.3.1 concerning development within the Greater Christchurch Area.

41. Objective 6.2.1(3) is "*avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS"* and policy 6.3.1(3) is to *"enable development of existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas, including intensification in appropriate locations, where it supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch"*

42. I consider it relevant that both provisions refer to existing urban areas as well as greenfield priority areas. I also note that Chapter 6 and Map A of the CRPS was inserted via the Land Use Recovery Plan in 2013, which was 3 years after the approval of PC45. Any reference to an existing urban area in Chapter 6 would therefore be expected to encompass any urban area existing at that time including undeveloped urban zoned land. On this basis I do not find that the omission of the SPRZ area as a greenfield priority area in Map A necessarily means that residential intensification of the land is contrary to the CRPS Chapter 6 provisions – the land was already zoned for urban use.

43. Turning to the NPS-UD provisions, I agree with Mr Clease and Mr Friedel that the SPRZ part of the site is an *Urban Environment* as defined in Clause 1.4 as it meets both tiers of that definition.

On this basis, I find that residential development of that land is plan enabled development to the extent provided for under the SPRZ and is not unanticipated or out of sequence development that would be subject to Policy 8.

44. I agree that the four additional RuUFZ properties are rural activities and are not identified as greenfield priority areas. Accordingly, they fall to be considered as unanticipated development under Policy 8.

45. Mr Friedel supported the rationale for integrating the RuUFZ land into the proposal, and this was supported by Ms Schröder's urban design assessment because it provides an urban form that is contained by Spencerville Road to the north, Turners Road and Teapes Road to the west, and the geophysical features of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River and lower terrace to the south and east, optimises the use of the elevated north-western terrace for residential housing in response to the land constraints within the lower terrace, and assists in making the servicing and infrastructure provision more viable.

46. The existing SPRZ is already zoned for urban activity and is not therefore considered to be Highly Productive Land (**HPL**) under the NPS-HPL. A small portion (0.5ha) of the RuUFZ land is HPL, however I agree with the opinion of Mr Yeoman that this small pocket is uneconomic to farm. Both Mr Friedel and Mr Clease agreed with this. I find that the incorporation of the RuUFZ land into the development is appropriate from an NPS-HPL and urban form perspective.

47. Ms Schröder and Mr Friedel expressed concern that the site is geographically isolated from other existing urban areas, and that this emphasises the need to demonstrate that the relevant statutory NPS-UD, CRPS and CDP tests can be satisfied. Mr Clease and Mr Compton-Moen both considered that the site is no more isolated than other comparable settlement areas within Greater Christchurch. Mr Friedel's s42A report considered that the proposal does not meet the relevant *"well-functioning urban environment"* tests of Policy 1 the NPS-UD in respect to transport, accessibility, stormwater management and natural hazard risks.

48. Significant additional evidence was provided to the hearing on these matters. As a result, Mr Friedel subsequently agreed in his summary statement that his earlier concerns had been addressed and he now considered that the proposal will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment in terms of Policy 1. I agree with his amended advice.

49. Whilst Ms Schröder remained concerned with the relative isolation of the site, I am mindful that the site, and in particular the upper terrace, is already zoned for urban activity equivalent in density to 300 - 400 households, and this effectively sets it apart from other potential rezonings of greenfield rural land in the District. Consideration of its contribution to a well-functioning urban environment must be considered in the Greater Christchurch context. In that respect I find that any effect of isolation already exists under the present zoning, and viewing the proposal as an intensification rather than a greenfield development, the effect of the increased development density in terms of transport, accessibility, stormwater and natural hazard risks has been adequately addressed. I also note that intensification of existing urban areas is encouraged by Policy 6.2.2 of the CRPS. Ms Carter disagreed with the proposal on the basis that the site is not located in an urban area that is specifically identified in Map A or the Christchurch Spatial Plan.

Whilst this may be the case, it is still located in an existing urban area to which Policy 6.2.2 would apply, and the NPS-UD policy 8 pathway which post-dates the CRPS is available.

50. I find that the proposal will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.

51. Accordingly, my recommendations are that submissions relating to Urban Form be **accepted, accepted in part, or rejected** in accordance with the recommendations contained in **Appendix One**.

Housing and Business Sufficiency and Development Feasibility

52. Sixteen submission points cover housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility, which were summarised by Mr Friedel as:

a. Support PPC23 as it will assist in addressing housing undersupply and provides a 'greenfield' housing option close to the city.

b. Oppose PPC23 as there is sufficient zoned land to meet 30 years of projected housing need, there has been no provision made for affordable or social housing, the economic analysis exaggerates the housing demand and overstates the economic benefits, the development feasibility of the 800hh yield is questionable as the applicant only owns a portion of the site and the commercial centre is insufficient to meet the needs that will be generated by the rezoning.

c. Seek an alternate relief that an independent peer review of the applicant's economic assessment is provided to establish the appropriateness of the proposed retail floor area, any adverse retail distribution effects and whether the economic outcomes identified in PPC23 are consistent with the district, regional and national directions on housing and business development.

53. Expert economic evidence was presented by Mr Colegrave for the applicant, and Mr Yeoman for the Council. Prior to the hearing, the two economic experts participated in witness caucusing and produced a joint witness statement (**JWS**). The JWS recorded the following areas of agreement:

a. The development is likely to meet the criteria in Policy 8 of the NPS-UD. Specifically, from an economic perspective, it is likely to:

i. be within the Urban Environment,

ii. be Significant, and

iii. contribute to well-functioning Urban Environment

b. The NPS-UD sets a minimum – not a maximum – in terms of development capacity required, and regardless of whether there is perceived to be a shortage or not, the development should still be assessed on its merits.

c. The Rural-zoned land identified as highly productive is unlikely to be commercially

productive for rural activities, given its small size and isolation from other highly productive land.

d. *The economic merits of the development are highly likely to be positive, notwithstanding differences in opinion regarding the scale of the benefits and costs outlined below and in our respective statements of evidence. Therefore, both economic experts agree that the development is supported on economic grounds.*

e. *There is insufficient greenfield capacity to meet demand in the long term (30 years) for Christchurch, and hence there is a need for more capacity to meet the Council's obligations under the NPS-UD.*

f. *The gross economic activity generated through construction and ongoing benefits (in GDP and employment terms) does not reflect the net economic benefits, as some of this activity would likely occur regardless of the development.*

g. *There will be a loss of rural production if the site is developed, which is a cost to be considered. However, this loss is relatively small.*

h. *Transport savings from the development will likely be positive but will be smaller than shown in the indicative assessment (which assumed that households would have otherwise lived in Rolleston or Rangiora).*

i. *The wider economic benefits will be positive, but less significant than the quantified benefits*

54. The experts also partially agreed that there may be insufficient capacity to meet demand in Christchurch in the short to medium term, hence a need for more capacity under the NPS-UD.

55. Both Mr Friedel and Mr Clease agreed that on the basis of the economic evidence, PC23 would deliver significant supply in the context of Policy 8 of the NPS-UD, and that the additional supply enabled through PC23 would assist in meeting the demand for 'greenfield' subdivisions, standalone housing and the provision of larger residential lots, while emphasising that this provision would be small given that the minimum 15hh/ha density requirements need to be met across the site in accordance with the CDP Strategic Directions, objectives, policies and rules and CRPS objectives and policies regarding intensification and urban density.

56. Ms Carter disagreed with these conclusions, on the basis that the Council has recently demonstrated through the Greater Christchurch Partnership's Housing Development Capacity Assessment that it has sufficient plan-enabled and feasible capacity to meet 30-year housing demand. She did however acknowledge that there is nothing preventing a Tier 1 Council from providing more than enough capacity to meet demand.

57. Given the economic evidence, I find that PC23 will meet the criteria of Policy 8 NPS-UD in that it would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.

58. I also find that given the evidence of Mr Moffat and Mr Colegrave that the previously proposed Golf Course development is no longer economically feasible, that the alternative use for housing at an intensified level, of land that is already zoned for urban use, is an economically efficient

outcome, and is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of s32(1)(a) and giving effect to the NPS-UD, compared to the alternatives of retaining the status quo, or rezoning for another use such as rural activity.

59. The only remaining matter of contention between the two economists related to the size of the proposed Commercial Centre. Mr Colegrave considered that the centre capped at 3000m^2 GFA will not result in adverse retail distribution effects on other centres and would remain within the ambit of the size and function of a neighbourhood centre meeting local convenience needs. If the need for such a sized centre did not eventuate, there is a simple consent pathway for alternative use for housing.

60. Mr Yeoman agreed that adverse retail distribution effects will not arise, however considered that the 1.5ha of land occupied by a proposed centre would be economically inefficient, and that a smaller 0.5ha area with a 1000m^2 GFA cap should be provided for. This would still be sufficient to meet local needs, but would be more efficient, and enable an additional 1ha of land to be freed up for housing. He was concerned that a consent process to change the use would result in an unnecessary cost, time delay and inefficiency which would ultimately be borne by homeowners and the Council,

61. I have considered both viewpoints – and note that the 3000m^2 GFA is a maximum. There are at least three major supermarkets located within a 5-10 minute driving distance from the site at Prestons, Belfast and Northwood, therefore it is unlikely that an additional large supermarket would be proposed on the PC23 land. Commercial uses would be most likely to comprise small local premises meeting everyday needs such as a small grocery / convenience store, personal services such as hair and beauty treatments, café / bakery and maybe a local restaurant / bar. Whilst 1000m^2 may be sufficient to meet these everyday needs, I also note that other comparable local centres often include other activities such as a health providers, gyms and fitness studios, etc which may require larger premises. I agree that the larger 3000m^2 GFA would provide flexibility for other such facilities.

62. Ultimately, the economic risk and viability of the Commercial centre is one which will be borne by the developer. They will make their decisions on the basis of their understanding of local market demands. Whilst there may be a cost if the full 3000m^2 is not developed, that is a cost on the developer. The option will always remain for any undeveloped land to be reverted to use for housing or other uses at a later date. I disagree that householders and the Council would bear the cost of such a future application – the cost of holding the land and subsequently applying for alternative residential use would be borne by the developer.

63. For this reason, I consider that the Neighbourhood centre should remain capped at 3000m^2 GFA.

64. On the basis of the above findings I recommend that the submissions relating to housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility be **accepted** insofar as they support PC23 as addressing housing supply, **rejected** insofar as they oppose PC23 on the basis of there being sufficient zoned land to meet projected housing need, and **accepted in part** to the extent that further economic assessment has established the appropriateness of the proposed retail floor

area.

Character, Amenity and Visual Effects

65. Fifty-one submission points cover character, amenity and visual effects, which were summarised by Mr Friedel as:

    a. Support PPC23 as it will offer lifestyle options and enhance the character and amenity of the area.

    b. Hold a neutral position but identify that PPC23 is far removed from the Whisper Creek golf resort concept and request that controls are included to preserve natural values.

    c. Oppose PPC23 as it will significantly increase the density of development in the area that will compromise the existing lifestyle living and small settlement character, undermine rural residential and rural amenity, result in adverse landscape and visual effects, and loss of openness.

    d. Seek an alternate relief that includes limiting the development to 165 houses, that more extensive road boundary setbacks and a greenbelt buffer with the lower terrace are provided in the ODP, the adverse effects are mitigated, a high standard of housing is specified and a larger portion of the site is utilised for stormwater management. More specifically, one submission requests the following amendments to PPC23 and the CDP.

        i. Non-complying activity for any subdivision that is inconsistent with the ODP that fails to satisfy RDA Rule RD 2 in 8.5.1.5.

        ii. A new ODP in Appendix 8.4.1.2 that includes existing and new roading, stormwater areas, areas to be protected for natural values and open space.

        iii. Reference the extended pedestrian and cycling network and internal loop road in the ODP and the relevant objectives and policies.

66. I heard from several local property owners, who reside on rural lifestyle properties, and value the rural character and amenity values that the present environment offers. Residents placed high value on their rural outlook, the peaceful character, and the ability for them and their families to enjoy the rural environment, including walking, riding and cycling on quiet local roads, and swimming in the Pūharakekenui/Styx River.

67. However, I must also consider that the present environment does not represent the type of environment that is anticipated under the SPRZ provisions. It is unrealistic to expect that the land will remain in its present rural state.

68. In that respect, I consider that any assessment of character, amenity and visual effects should commence with what is anticipated under the SPRZ provisions, rather than comparing it with the existing rural uses.

69. The main area in contention is development of the upper terrace where the proposed housing

would be located. The lower terrace is proposed to be used for rural activity, stormwater attenuation, and ecological enhancement of the river margins. The outcomes in respect of the lower terrace will remain little changed from what exists now, and what would have existed with a golf course development on the lower land. It is arguable that the now proposed farming and ecological enhancement uses will provide positive outcomes, compared to a cultivated golf course, which may appear less natural.

70. Turning to the upper terrace, there are obvious differences in visual impact due to proposed development being denser, and closer to surrounding properties than what would occur under the SPRZ provisions, and due to the inclusion of the four RuUFZ properties.

71. Expert landscape architectural evidence was provided by Mr Compton-Moen for the applicant (who provided Urban Design evidence also) and Ms Smetham for the Council. They participated in caucusing jointly with Ms Schröder and produced a Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**) combining urban design and landscape issues.

72. As a result of the caucusing and JWS, the experts reached several areas of agreement, leading to suggested changes to the proposals to address visual impact concerns.

73. I summarise the main areas of agreement as:

a. The receiving environment is a modified landscape characterised by pastoral land use, lifestyle properties and rural residential development.

b. The wider landscape is not pristine nor highly natural in character, although the Pūharakekenui/Styx River corridor contains recognised ecological, cultural and landscape values.

c. The existing SPRZ forms an important component of the anticipated environment.

d. Of the two areas, the upper terrace is more appropriate for development.

e. The 4 lifestyle blocks in the northwestern quadrant of the site proposed for rezoning should be included to ensure a coherent and comprehensive development pattern.

f. The ODP Should include:

i. Ecological enhancement of waterways.

ii. Off-road pedestrian and cycle connections.

iii. A 2500-3000m^2 reserve in the northwestern residential quadrant.

g. The location of the commercial area is a key component of the success of the village and should be retained for development for a minimum of 10 years.

h. Street lighting design should minimise adverse effect on the surrounding rural and ecological environment.

i. Particular attention is required to the edge treatment and management at the interface with the surrounding RuUF zone including:

i. Larger perimeter lots along road frontages.

ii. At least 60% of perimeter lots to be a minimum 1000m^2.

iii. Increased building setbacks of 20m for at least 60% of sites along perimeter road frontages.

iv. Rural style fencing, planting and controlled vehicle access as interface mitigation measures.

v. 3m planted buffer to provide for amenity and address rural character.

vi. Recognise significance of Pūharakekenui/Styx River corridor to Ngāi Tahu.

j. Incorporation of Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines into the ODP narrative was considered appropriate.

74. Areas of partial agreement and areas of disagreement were mostly focussed on urban design outcomes and not on visual character and amenity effects.

75. Ms Smetham considered that some visual effects had been underestimated by Mr Compton-Moen due to variations in fill level and finished levels in relation to surrounding roads. Mr Compton-Moen disagreed on the basis that variability in levels already exist across the site.

76. Ms Smetham considered that a reduced building height from 8m to single storey should be imposed on the larger perimeter sites to provide for variation at the RuUF interface. Mr Compton-Moen disagreed on the basis that variation of heights will occur through individual designs, and that the rural zone permits 9m buildings in any case.

77. Ms Smetham proposed that the use of recessive colours and materials for buildings located along the perimeter of the site to Teapes, Turners and Spencerville Roads is appropriate. Mr Compton-Moen did not agree that this is necessary as there are currently no colour controls for development in the receiving environment.

78. Overall Ms Smetham agreed that whilst PC23 will change the character of the area to one that is more suburban in character, compared to that which currently exists, and / or is anticipated to exist under the SPRZ provisions, if the additional measures are provided the effects will be low to moderate.

79. Several amendments are now proposed to the ODP and rules to give effect to the agreements met between the landscape experts. Mr Friedel advised in his summary statement that whilst there continued to be areas of disagreement and partial disagreement between the landscape experts, there were options to amend the ODP provisions to address the remaining concerns in respect of integrating the site into the environment.

80. I have considered the remaining areas of concern and am also mindful that Policy 6 of the NPS-UD directs decision makers to have particular regard that planned urban built form may involve significant changes to an area and that those changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by others, and that those changes are not of themselves an adverse effect.

81. Whilst development under the SPRZ provisions would have provided for lower density and increased setbacks from Turners, Spencerville and Teapes Roads, it nonetheless would have still resulted in significant urban built form due to 150 dwellings and large apartment and accommodation blocks, which would result in a developed non-rural appearance.

82. The edge treatment now being proposed is consistent with, and I consider arguably provides a higher level of amenity than, that provided in other rural / urban interfaces throughout Greater Christchurch, and to that degree I find it appropriate.

83. In relation to the remaining areas of contention between the landscape architects, I agree with Ms Smetham and Mr Friedel that additional controls on height and internal setbacks should be applied to the larger lots adjoining Spencerville, Turners and Teapes Roads. This will provide for variability of design and height along the interface. I however agree with Mr Clease that a 5m height may be overly restrictive and should be increased to 5.5m to allow for pitched roofs.

84. I do not consider that a requirement for recessive colours and materials is necessary. The site is not located in an area of significant or outstanding landscape values, and dwellings will be partially or fully screened when edge landscaping treatment is established.

85. On the basis of the above assessments, I find that the character, amenity and visual effects of development will be acceptable, and can be adequately mitigated through the suggested ODP amendments.

86. My recommendation is that submissions relating to character, amenity and visual effects be **accepted** insofar as they support PC23, **accepted in part** insofar as they request controls to preserve natural values, and **rejected** insofar as they oppose PC23, or seek alternative relief to limit development to 165 houses with increased setbacks and buffers, as contained in **Appendix Two.**

Infrastructure, Land Development and Nuisance effects

87. Several submissions were lodged concerning infrastructure requirements including water, wastewater and stormwater, utility services, reserves and community facilities, and the effects of land development.

Wastewater

88. A key concern raised by submitters including the SRA, ORG and Mr Messerly related to the condition and capacity of the reticulated wastewater system to serve the development. Of particular concern was the condition of the wastewater system serving Spencerville, which the development is proposed to connect to. There were concerns that the condition of the network has significantly deteriorated following the Christchurch Earthquake, such that capacity is reduced, and frequent failures result in sewage overflows at Spencerville.

89. Expert evidence on infrastructure provision was provided by Mr Hall for the applicant, and Ms McDonald for the Council. The experts participated in conferencing and produced a JWS.

90. Ms McDonald advised that the proposed plan change area is not serviced by a reticulated wastewater network. The nearest Council wastewater network is the gravity sewer located in

Lower Styx Road, which conveys wastewater to the downstream Heyders Pumpstation (PS78). From this pump station, wastewater is pumped through Bottle Lake Forest to the Parklands gravity wastewater network.

91. The applicants propose that the development be serviced with a low-pressure network that will pump to Spencerville. Upgrades to the Spencerville pumping station are proposed following modelling and testing by the applicant, to deal with additional flows. Rejuvenation of the accompanying rising sewer main is proposed.

92. Mr Hall advised that the proposed upgrades would improve the capacity of the wastewater network and clarified that modelling was conservative and took into account extreme weather events. He noted the concerns expressed by Mr Nimmo for ORG as to the condition and resilience of the existing wastewater system and considered that following the upgrades, these existing issues would improve.

93. Ms McDonald confirmed that wastewater capacity can be provided through new and upgraded infrastructure. Her conclusions on the capacity and performance of the wastewater network relied on a 2018 calibrated, peer-reviewed model, supported by recent performance testing and validated against 20 years of rainfall data. She recommended that all new and upgraded infrastructure be delivered under an Infrastructure Provider Agreement (**IPA**) to ensure fit-for-purpose designs based on comprehensive site investigations and Council's specific infrastructure design requirements.

94. Both experts agreed through the JWS that wastewater servicing for the development is feasible.

95. I have considered the concerns raised by submitters as to the condition and capacity of the existing Spencerville wastewater system to accept flows from the development. Whilst there are presently issues with the condition of the existing reticulated system, these will be resolved at the developer's expense through the proposed upgrades. I also note that ultimately it is the Council's decision as network utility operator whether or not to accept connection to its system, and to determine the design standards and conditions to be applied to any upgrade. Given the expert evidence provided I find that the proposal is able to be adequately serviced for wastewater.

96. I recommend that those submissions that oppose PC23 on the basis of insufficient wastewater capacity be **rejected.**

Water Supply

97. Both experts agreed that there is no spare water capacity in Spencerville to serve development of the PC23 land. The proposed development will be required to establish a new borefield and water treatment plant to Council standards, which will also be connected to the Spencerville water supply network.

98. Both experts agreed through the JWS that the site can be serviced for potable water. Whilst some submitters raised concerns regarding water supply, no other expert evidence on this issue was provided.

99. I accept the evidence of the experts as expressed in the JWS and find that the PC23

development is able to be adequately serviced by potable water.

100. I recommend that those submissions opposing PC23 on the basis of inadequate water supply be **rejected.**

Stormwater

101. Several submissions raised concerns regarding the effects of stormwater flows from the site into the surrounding environment, including effects on the Pūharakekenui-Styx Stormwater Management area, and effects of runoff from properties at the upper terrace onto nearby properties. Expert evidence was provided by Mr Hall for the applicant and Mr Norton for the Council, who also participated in expert conferencing and produced a JWS.

102. Mr Hall advised that it is intended that the project will use the existing Council Global Consent for the treatment and discharge of stormwater, CRC252424.

103. The treatment of the stormwater will involve discharge from the developed site into a first flush basin or basins and then by an attenuated flow into a wetland for final treatment. The treated stormwater will discharge into Spencerville Drain and flow north to connect to the Styx River.

104. The first flush basins will be designed in accordance with the Council's Waterways Wetlands and Drainage Guide to receive the first 25mm of rainfall. The water in the first flush basins will be released over a four-day period to the wetlands, which will be designed with a two-day residence time. It is also proposed that the system be designed to provide full attenuation of the 1 in 100 critical storm event using the NIWA sourced HIRDS RCP8.5 data for the 2081-2100 predicted storm intensities.

105. Mr Norton raised concerns in the s42A report as to the need for assessment of the future effects of elevated groundwater combined with Sea Level Rise (**SLR**) on the functioning of the proposed stormwater basins and wetlands. Additional information was provided in evidence from Mr Dark that future groundwater levels are expected to rise by 1.2m in line with SLR. Dr Kearse provided further evidence on the potential effects of Vertical Land Movement (**VLM**) which indicated that subsidence of up to 400mm should be allowed for over the next 100 years.

106. Allowing for these factors, Mr Hall considered that the land available for stormwater treatment is extensive, thereby enabling large, shallow basins to be delivered rather than smaller, deeper basins that might be preferred on more geographically constrained sites with greater separation between ground levels and groundwater.

107. Mr Hall considered that allowing for stormwater storage depth, hydraulic head, and freeboard leads to a predicted Finished Floor Level (**FFL**) of approximately RL4.10 m on the upper terrace. This would be achieved primarily via bulk earthworks/ filling of the upper terrace as part of subdivision/ land development phases. Individual house foundation designs will then confirm the FFL is achieved. He noted that bulk earthworks to achieve this would require parts of the upper terrace to be raised by up to 1m. He considered this to be typical for a development of this nature.

108. Some submitters expressed concerns over effects of stormwater ponding that already occurs on the upper terrace and that this will be exacerbated by increased development runoff.

However, given that flows within the development will be directed to roads and reserves before discharging to the detention basins, increased runoff to adjoining properties would not occur.

109. Mr Norton confirmed that following provision of additional information, he was satisfied that PC23 will be able to adequately mitigate its effects on stormwater quality and quantity through the provision of stormwater mitigation facilities that will be designed in accordance with Council's standards and consents and vested to Council through the subdivision process. Development enabled by PC23 will be able to adequately protect new dwellings from flood hazards with reasonable considerations for Climate Change, SLR and VLM.

110. He confirmed that under the Council's global consent, stormwater is required to be managed in order that there is a 100mm maximum increase in river levels measured at the Harbour Road Bridge, based on 2012 levels. Any new greenfield development is also required to achieve 100% retention of all stormwater in a 1 in 50 year event for a minimum of 96 hours.

111. Mr Norton also advised that the conditions of any granted stormwater consent will require that all post development drainage be internal to the site so as not to increase any flows to neighbours. It will be the applicant's responsibility to control water within its site.

112. The JWS provided by the two experts agreed that the Site can be serviced for stormwater treatment and storage in terms of the Council Global Consent CRC252424 by establishing new basins and wetlands on site and ensuring that compensatory volumes are fully considered. Having considered the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards (2025), and with specific reference to Policy 6, they considered the natural hazard risk of flooding, including for 100 years of climate change, is moderate to low within the area of the site where development activities would take place.

113. On the basis of the above discussion, I find that PC23 can be adequately serviced for stormwater and associated flood risk can be appropriately managed.

114. I recommend that submissions supporting or opposing PC23 on the basis of stormwater and flooding effects, and those submissions seeking additional evidence to mitigate stormwater effects be **accepted, rejected** or **accepted in part** in accordance with the table in **Appendix Two.**

Utilities

115. Two submitters opposed PC23 on the basis that there is a lack of telecommunication and power utility services in the area to support the additional demand.

116. Mr Friedel outlined that the PC23 Infrastructure Servicing Report records the approach for establishing power and telecommunication services to the site and each property. He considered that the determination of the future connections to power and telecommunication services is best managed at the time of subdivision following engagement with utility service providers by the developer.

117. I agree with that approach and find that PC23 is able to be adequately provided with utility services.

118. I recommend that the submissions opposing PC23 due to lack of servicing be **rejected.**

Neighbourhood Parks

119. Two submissions support PPC23 as it will improve the recreational opportunities in the area, while neutral submissions sought that the developer partner with the Styx Living Laboratory Trust and include additional reserve requirements similar to the Whisper Creek golf resort. Two submission points opposed PPC23 on the basis that there are insufficient amenities provided.

120. Mr Friedel referred to evidence provided by Mr Barnes Senior - Parks and Policy Planner at Council, who considered that the PPC23 ODP makes appropriate provision for three Neighbourhood Parks that are each approximately 3,000m^2 in size and achieve Council's levels of service proximity and accessibility metrics. These Neighbourhood Parks would be expected to include playground facilities and be co-located with the stormwater basins to maximise passive recreation opportunities, which he considered is appropriate and consistent with similar urban environments across Christchurch.

121. Mr Friedel supported Mr Barnes' conclusion that active recreation areas have been adequately provided for in the PPC23 ODP through the provision of a network of publicly accessible walkways that would promote active travel modes and movement through the settlement and to key destinations near the site. He also supported Mr Barnes' request that the ODP text is amended from the general reference to the size of the Neighbourhood Parks to be determined at the time of subdivision to the more definitive prescription of the 3,000m^2 size, to maintain consistency with Council's reserves management policies.

122. No other evidence was presented on this matter, and I accept the advice of Mr Barnes and Mr Friedel. I find that the PC23 proposals will adequately provide for neighbourhood parks within the ODP framework.

123. I recommend that the submissions relating to provision of neighbourhood parks and recreation areas be **accepted** or **rejected** as set out in **Appendix Two.**

Land Development and Nuisance Effects

124. Some submissions oppose PPC23 because the additional population and land development works will generate nuisance effects that will compromise amenity and natural habitats, including through dust, vibration and light spill.

125. Mr Friedel noted that the CDP already contains provisions that deal with some of these issues, including rules relating to noise limits and controlling light spill and construction phase earthworks. Subdivision consents also typically include requirements for Earthworks Management Plans and Stormwater Management Plans which deal with nuisance effects including construction phase stormwater and sediment control. I also note that construction and operational phase earthworks and stormwater consents will be required from Environment Canterbury (**ECan**) which will contain similar controls, and that the dust control provisions of the ECan Land and Water Regional Plan will apply to any site works.

126. On the basis of the above discussion I find that any land development and nuisance effects will be able to be appropriately dealt with by existing CDP and ECan plan rules, and through the

consenting processes.

127. I recommend that those submissions that oppose PC23 due to land development and nuisance effects be **rejected.**

Community Facilities

128. Submissions were lodged both in support and opposition to PC23 on the basis of effects on community facilities including Ouruhia Model School. Whilst some submitters in opposition considered that the school roll is constrained, evidence from Dr Wall on behalf of the school itself was supportive, on the basis that it would align with the school objectives and its long-term sustainability. The school currently has a roll of 17-20 pupils and has previously been under threat of closure. It has a capacity within its existing infrastructure for up to 150 pupils, and the development will enable efficient use of the existing school asset.

129. I accept the advice of Dr Wall and find that PC23 will have a positive effect on Ouruhia School.

130. I recommend that submissions relating to community facilities be **accepted or rejected** in accordance with the table in **Appendix Two.**

Transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility

131. Seventy-five submission points cover transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility, which Mr Friedel summarised as covering:

a. Support for PPC23 as it will improve the local road network through cycling connections that include onto Lower Styx Road and adjacent to the Pūharakekenui-Styx River and because it will increase the possibility of access to public transport.

b. Support for PC23 in part where the ODP facilitates a safe active travel route to Ōuruhia Model School and the transport infrastructure development is staged.

c. Holding a neutral position but identifying that an ITA is required, that the developer needs to fund any network upgrades, conditions are applied to enhance cycle safety connectivity, birdlife is protected through speed limits and signage, and access is provided to Lower Styx Road.

d. Confirmation that the rezoning is consistent with NPS-UD Policy 8 in respect to “out of sequence” development and the extent to which PPC23 contributes to a “well-functioning urban environment”.

e. Oppose PC23 because the increased vehicle movements will compromise safety, increase congestion and generate nuisance effects, and the absence of footpaths and public transport. Additional concerns include compromised safety along Styx Road and the Turners Road and Marshland Road and Marshland Road and Spencerville Road intersections, the absence of railway barriers and limited visibility at the Chaney’s Road crossing, increased carbon and greenhouse gas emissions and delays during tsunami evacuation events that could compromise human safety. One submission point requests that the CDP and PPC23 ODP are amended to include an internal ‘collector loop’ to support public transport and an extended

pedestrian cycle link to Ōuruhia Model School, Bottle Lake Forest, and the Prestons suburb.

f. Seeking alternate relief that includes reinstating the Lower Styx Road bridge and Turners Road pathway, managing the number of vehicles using the Lower Styx Road bridge, deficiencies in the ITA are addressed, tsunami evacuation time modelling is completed, significant safety upgrades to Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road and funded, the shared pathway is redesigned along Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road and the adverse effects identified in the primary submissions are mitigated.

132. Expert transportation evidence was provided by Mr Fuller for the applicant, Mr D Smith for the Council, and Mr G Smith for the ORG. Ms Carter also discussed effects on the roading network in her planning evidence, however also adopted the evidence of Mr G Smith. All three transportation experts participated in expert conferencing and produced a JWS.

133. The JWS recorded the following areas of agreement:

a. The residential traffic generation rate is appropriate.

b. The method of determining the residential distribution was pragmatic, but there are ways this could have been done better. The resultant distribution of residential traffic to the network is intuitively correct.

c. The proposed walking and cycling connections are appropriate noting the addition of a shared path to Spencerville and direct shared path connection along Turners Road (between Teapes Road and the school) as requested by Mr D Smith and addressed by Mr Fuller in evidence.

d. The experts agree that Safe System Audits will be required for the internal roads and road upgrades, including the design of the Turners Road / Teapes Road intersection. There are engineering solutions that can be implemented to improve the safety at this intersection, including accounting for the development traffic.

e. The Spencerville Road one-lane bridge has a traffic estimate of 500 vehicles per day which operates well below the levels of other comparable one-lane bridges. The experts consider that there is capacity at the Spencerville Road one-lane bridge to accommodate a substantial increase in traffic including any increase due to the Plan Change without a noticeable deterioration in performance.

134. I agree with and adopt these findings.

135. There were several remaining areas of partial agreement or disagreement between the experts. I discuss these in turn.

Commercial Centre

136. Both Mr Smith's were concerned at the scale of the Neighbourhood Centre due to potential impact on the operation if the transport network – in particular if a large supermarket were proposed. If the scale of the commercial centre is out-of-step with the residential catchment it may draw traffic from further afield including Spencerville and west of Marshland Road. Mr Fuller

did not consider this likely as there are existing supermarkets which would be more attractive to those catchments at Prestons and Belfast.

137. In response to this issue, the suggested amended ODP provisions contained in the Planners JWS included a proposed provision that would exclude a supermarket of more than 450m^2. There was minor disagreement between Mr Clease and Mr Friedel as to the wording of the provision with Mr Friedel seeking an overall exclusion for supermarkets, and Mr Clease preferring that a limit of 450m^2 be applied to be consistent with the RNN zone Commercial Centre rules.

138. I agree with Mr Clease that an outright exclusion of all supermarkets is not necessary, provided that the scale is retained at a low level that would predominantly meet local needs, and be less attractive to customers from wider afield. I agree that the 450m^2 limit proposed by Mr Clease is appropriate.

Primary Access to Development (Turners Rd vs Lower Styx Road)

139. Mr G Smith was opposed to the use of Turners Road as the primary access for the development and considered that no analysis had been provided of the effects of an access to lower Styx Road. This would result in a traffic environment being experienced by Turners Road residents that has never been envisaged under the SPRZ.

140. Mr D Smith and Mr Fuller agreed that a vehicle connection to Lower Styx Road is not required if there is suitable assessment of and mitigation provided for Turners Road, including the intersection with Marshland Road.

141. The experts all agreed that if it was accepted that Lower Styx Road cannot be used for vehicle access, and the Plan Change is approved, that the mitigation as proposed by Mr Fuller is appropriate and should be suitably reflected in the Plan Provisions and ODP, noting also that timing of the Marshland / Turners intersection upgrade is also to be resolved.

142. Mr Clease's Planning Rebuttal evidence and Mr. Halls Summary Statement questioned the viability of a direct road connection from the site to Lower Styx Road. This is due to the risk that the bridge and road connection would be inundated during a flooding event. Mr D Smith and Mr Fuller both considered that a road connection to Lower Styx Road is less viable than the primary connections from Turners Road and Spencerville Road.

143. I agree that primary connection to Lower Styx Road would be less viable, and potentially subject to flood risk than the more direct access available from Turners Road. Whilst a bridge and access road serving a SPRZ golf resort and residential development would also be subject to flood risk, the risk to residents and users including inability for emergency vehicles to access is significantly greater with a larger number of dwellings. I am also conscious that a large volume of earthworks within the lower terrace would be required to construct such an access, which will disrupt flood paths and be inconsistent with the proposed ecological restoration and enhancement of the river margins.

144. Whilst access from Turners Road will result in increased traffic experienced by local residents, this is a situation which will occur with any residential rezoning, and I agree that any effects on

safety can be adequately mitigated through the additional measures proposed by Mr Fuller. These have been reflected in the draft amended ODP provisions attached to the Planners JWS.

145. For the above reasons I find that the use of Turners Road for primary access is acceptable, subject to additional mitigation measures as proposed.

Spencerville Road - LCSIA

146. All experts agreed that a level crossing safety assessment is required for the Spencerville Road rail crossing. They agreed that the existing crossing is deficient and would be exacerbated by the development.

147. Disagreement remained as to the appropriate method of funding for such an assessment and any required upgrades. Mr Fuller considered that development contributions should be used, as the need for upgrade is not wholly attributable to the development.

148. I agree with the advice of Mr Friedel in this regard – that it is not necessary to resolve this issue at this stage, and it can be dealt with at the time of subdivision. The requirement for a LSCIA is included in the draft amended ODP provisions provided with the Planners JWS.

Spencerville Road Cross Section

149. All experts agreed that Spencerville Road between the site entrance and Marshland Road should be upgraded to a 7.5m width. Differences in opinion related to whether this should be wholly developer funded or partially funded through developer contributions. Mr Fuller considered that development contributions should be utilised, as the widening would also address existing concerns with current traffic, and widening would not have been required under the SPRZ proposals.

150. I agree with the advice of Mr Friedel that the funding mechanism can be determined separately at the time of subdivision, and it is not necessary to resolve that matter now.

151. The requirement for a 7.5m sealed carriageway width is now included in the draft ODP amendments attached to the Planners JWS, and I find this amendment to be appropriate.

Construction Traffic

152. All experts agreed that a Construction Traffic Management Plan is a suitable mechanism for managing effects relating to construction traffic. Both Mr Smiths agreed that construction traffic should be excluded from Turners Road, and that this should be reflected in the ODP. Mr Fuller considered that whilst he agreed that Turners Road should not be used for construction traffic, this would be best managed through the construction management plan process.

153. Mr Friedel has suggested wording to this effect in the amended ODP provisions. Mr Clease did not agree however considered that if wording is included, it should be limited to heavy vehicles only so as not to exclude light trade vehicles.

154. I have considered both options and find that a specific provision in the ODP as preferred by Mr Friedel should be included, as it provides a greater deal of certainty for local residents as to what construction traffic may be expected.

Traffic Modelling

155. Mr G Smith was critical of the traffic modelling undertaken of the Marshland Road / Turners Road and Marshland Road / Main North Road / Spencerville Road intersections due to out of date 2018 inputs being used, and assumptions made as to household characteristics, with the modellers using 'forecast' data based no 2021 traffic counts. He considered that 2023 census data could have been used. Using 2021 data as a validation base is problematic due to the effect of the Covid pandemic at that time.

156. The experts agreed that this matter could not be resolved at his time, and noted that all models have limitations. Mr D Smith reviewed the CAST modelled traffic volumes along Marshland Road in the vicinity of the Turners and Spencerville Road intersections, and concluded that:

    a. The models match observed traffic counts along the corridor (which may be expected because of the calibration process adopted by the CAST modellers).

    b. The level of background growth in traffic along Marshland Road between 2025 and 2038 reflects a substantial increase in southbound morning peak and northbound evening peak traffic which may occur as Kaiapoi and surrounding areas continue to develop.

157. I note that the other experts agreed with these findings.

Traffic modelling – Intersection Modelling

158. Following review of the Sidra Intersection modelled traffic volumes along Marshland Road in the vicinity of the Turners and Spencerville Road intersections, the experts noted that the Sidra modelling at the Marshland / Turners intersection includes sensitivity tests which add up to 30% more development traffic through the Turners Road intersection than that forecast by the CAST model. This means it is plausible that a higher level of traffic may eventuate along the Turners Road corridor. If this is the case the quantum of development that can be supported prior to the proposed intersection upgrade may be less.

159. Based on this analysis, the experts agreed that the 700-lot threshold for intersection upgrade contained in the proposal represents a point in time at which the intersection reaches capacity and delays for right turning traffic approach amount to 50 seconds during the morning peak hour. This may lead to driver frustration and risky manoeuvres. For this reason, the experts considered that the intersection upgrade should occur before more than 500 residential lots are created.

160. Whilst Mr G Smith still considered that connection to Lower Styx Road is preferred, he agreed that this approach should be adopted if Turners Road provides primary access.

161. Given my conclusions on this matter above, I agree that Turners Road should provide the primary access, and that an ODP amendment to provide the intersection upgrade prior to 500 lots being created should be included.

162. My overall finding is that effects of PC23 on transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility are appropriate and are able to be managed through the ODP provisions. My recommendation

is that the submissions relating to Transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility be **accepted, rejected** or **accepted in part** in accordance with the Table in **Appendix Two.**

Human Health and Natural Hazard risks

163. Sixty-three submission points cover human health and natural hazard risks. These were summarised by Mr Friedel and include:

a. Potential presence of contaminated soil at 165 Turners Road.

b. Oppose PC23 as the site is subject to natural hazard risks, including flooding of the land from the Pūharakekenui--Styx River and drains during high rainfall and tsunami events, susceptibility to sea level rise and climate change, and liquefaction, lateral displacement and land instability during earthquake events.

c. Seek an alternate relief that the natural hazard risks are mitigated, and the full suite of natural hazard risk assessments are provided, including geotechnical, tidal, hydrological and regional consenting feasibility assessments.

d. Oppose PC23 because of the risks associated with contaminated soil and radio frequency emissions from the Ōuruhia radio transmission tower and transmitting station.

e. Seek an alternate relief that the full suite of contaminated land assessments is provided to identify and address the presence of any contaminated soil on the site.

164. Evidence on contaminated soil issues was provided by Mr Mongillo, who noted that the PSI carried out on parts of the site identify potential sources of contamination due to previous farming activities that would require further DSI work and possibly remedial action prior to subdivision and/or development of the land. He considered that it is less than likely that rezoning the Site from rural to residential and commercial/industrial land will have a more than minor impact on human health or the environment from a land contamination perspective.

165. He considered that any soil contamination issues can be properly dealt with through the NES-CS consenting process for subdivision and development of the land, and through the ECan consenting processes for construction phase stormwater discharge consents and did not form an impediment to rezoning.

166. Mr Friedel agreed that the NES-CS requirements will mean that any risk to people's health and wellbeing can be effectively managed.

167. I agree with that conclusion and also note that the same issues would arise with development under the present SPRZ provisions.

168. Mr Teear provided evidence relating to natural coastal hazard risks to the site and provided a Tsunami risk assessment in accordance with the NPS-NH 2025. He considered that there is no immediate or long term threat to the properties from sea level rise, and that tsunami risk from extreme sea levels may flood the lower terrace, but will not reach the upper terrace. He considered that the 1:2500 tsunami coupled with SLR of 1.06m in 2010 would reach the upper terrace but be below the 4.10m FFL.

169. Accordingly he considered that in terms of the NPS-NH, the likelihood level of inundation from coastal processes is rare/ the consequence level is moderate for the upper terrace, giving low risk on the risk matrix.

170. No other evidence was provided in relation to coastal hazard risk, and I accept Mr Teear's findings.

171. Expert geotechnical assessment was provided in evidence by Mr Trainor who considered that based on a high-level NPS-NH 2025 assessment, the proposed development area is considered to present an overall low to medium natural hazard risk, with identified geotechnical hazards capable of being appropriately managed through established mitigation measures, subdivision design, and detailed engineering assessment at later consenting stages.

172. Mr Charters provided advice that was attached to Mr Friedel's s42A report that noted that the PC23 site is subject to liquefaction hazard risks that are not substantially greater than other areas in Ōtautahi Christchurch and can likely be mitigated using standard geotechnical techniques. This was consistent with the evidence of Mr Trainor.

173. I accept the above advice and find that the development of the site is acceptable from a geotechnical risk perspective.

174. I have discussed flood risk in the above sections relating to stormwater management. Whilst several submitters provided details of localised flooding events, the examples provided were mainly located in the lower terrace area, where development is not being proposed.

175. Whilst evidence was provided of localised ponding of parts of the upper terrace, the upper terrace areas will be modified through development including filling, recontouring and provision of detention basins and will be subject to minimum floor levels. The minimum 4.10m FFL also takes into account both SLR and VLM.

176. Both Mr Hall and Mr Norton agreed that flood risks associated with the development can be adequately mitigated.

177. I accept that advice and find that flood hazard risk associated with the PC23 proposals will be appropriate and acceptable.

178. Mr Friedel did not consider that the consented Ōuruhia transmission site and the radio frequency emissions associated with its operations present risks to human health. This is because the granted resource consents establish that the minimum radio frequency national standards were satisfied when consent was granted, and the operator is required to comply with the minimum radio frequency standards in the National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities. I agree with that advice and find that PC23 will not result in any increased risk of exposure of people to harmful electromagnetic radiation.

179. My recommendation is that submissions relating to human health and natural hazard risks be **accepted, rejected** or **accepted in part** as set out in the table in **Appendix Two.**

Reverse sensitivity

180. Eleven submission points are concerned with reverse sensitivity effects in relation to existing

farms, orchards and market gardens in the area. One submission point also considers that PC23 will compromise the consented Rolling Meadows festival.

181. I did not hear specific evidence or statements on this matter from any submitters. The advice of Mr Friedel was that he considered that any adverse reverse sensitivity effects arising from the future residents and any rural activities that continue on neighbouring properties will be negligible. This is because there are limited occasions where the site shares a direct boundary with neighbouring properties due to the separation provided by Spencerville Road to the north, Turners Road and Teapes Road to the east and the separation provided by the proposed RuUFZ, existing OWMZ, Pūharakekenui-Styx River and Lower Styx Road to the south. Rural interface treatment is also proposed along road boundaries.

182. I agree with that advice and find that any reverse sensitivity effects will be negligible.

183. I recommend that submissions opposing PC23 for reasons of reverse sensitivity be **rejected.**

Natural, Cultural and Historic Sites and Values

184. Sixty-seven submission points cover natural values, and heritage sites and cultural values. I discuss these issues in turn.

Natural Values

185. Submissions were lodged in support of PC23 as it makes provision for an extensive riparian margin, public access and ecological restoration of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River. Others were neutral and sought methods to enhance the Pūharakekenui-Styx River and its margins, the establishment of development controls and mitigation, and provision of management plans. Submissions in opposition were concerned that rezoning will compromise the natural and ecological values and habitats attributed to the site, the Pūharakekenui-Styx River and Brooklands Lagoon, or sought additional development controls and amendments to the ODP to mitigate effects of the rezoning on natural and ecological values and habitats.

186. Evidence on ecological values was provided by Ms Coates for the applicant, and an ecological peer review carried out by Dr Shadbolt was attached to the Council s42A report. Both ecologists agreed that the site contains ecological features of varying value.

187. Ms Coates considered that the Pūharakekenui-Styx River has high ecological values, Spencerville Drain has moderate values, and the existing wetlands have negligible to low values. She considered that PC23 provides opportunity to remove dense willow growth and weed species and undertake restoration and/or enhancement of the river's riparian margins. This would result in an increase in fauna habitat abundance and quality, increase the value of existing wetlands, and provide buffering functions to the river. She considered that appropriate stormwater management would mitigate potential impacts on freshwater features.

188. Dr Shadbolt's assessment was consistent with that of Ms Coates, and agreed that the ODP requirements present opportunities for ecological restoration and enhancement, particularly along the river corridor and through the creation of wetlands and stormwater treatment areas, and that the rezoning and subsequent consenting processes have the potential to deliver significant positive ecological outcomes for the site, while also offering options to mitigate the

impact of the increase in people in the area on wildlife.

189. No other expert evidence was presented in respect of ecological values, although some submitters raised concerns with potential effects of siltation and contamination affecting the river.

190. I am satisfied that such effects are able to be adequately avoided or mitigated through the development, and by standard consenting processes including the necessary ECan construction and operational stormwater discharge consents, NES-CS requirements, and the imposition of sediment control plans through the construction process.

191. I find that PC23 will provide for acceptable ecological outcomes, that are likely to result in net ecological benefits to the Pūharakekenui-Styx River and associated wetlands and riparian margins.

Cultural and Historic Values

192. Mr Friedel advised that the CDP and Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (**MIMP**) do not record any Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that Papatipu Rūnunga have sought to be protected in the CDP, including the Ngāi Wai (ID95) overlay that does not extend into the PPC23 site. No culturally significant sites were identified in the preliminary cultural impact assessment prepared by Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited on behalf of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

193. Mr Friedel noted that the cultural values of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River are able to be protected through avoiding urban development in the OMWZ portion of the site and that the application of the RuUFZ and Qualifying Matters to the lower terrace also limits the amount of urban development that can occur within this sensitive area.

194. Mr Messerly raised concerns that there are records of middens sites located on or near the site and that unknown archaeological material may be present on the site. He considered the proposal to present a significant risk to archaeological sites.

195. I agree with Mr Friedel that this is not uncommon with land developments, and that it is commonplace under RMA consenting processes to include conditions to ensure any artefacts that are discovered during the land development process are identified, the necessary authorities notified and actions taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate any related effects on cultural sites and values.

196. This is commonly achieved through the imposition of “accidental discovery” conditions on resource consents, and the requirement for archaeological authority to be obtained under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 to modify or destroy the whole or any part of an archaeological site.

197. For the above reasons I find that PC23 will not give rise to adverse effects on cultural values.

198. On the basis of the above evaluations and as recorded in **Appendix Two**, I recommend that the submissions received on natural, cultural and historical values are **accepted, accepted in part, or rejected.**

Property and Social Wellbeing

199. Thirty-two submissions raised issues concerning private property rights and social wellbeing, including effects on property values, rates, infrastructure funding, financial costs to property owners, and anti-social behaviour associated with retail activities.

200. I agree with the advice of Mr Friedel that these are either not relevant RMA matters, or are civil matters that fall under common law rights, or involve Local Government Act processes concerning management and funding of infrastructure.

201. I recommend that the submissions that oppose PC23 on the basis of property and well being effects be **rejected.**

Statutory Evaluation

202. Mr Friedel set out the general approach for consideration of a change to a district plan in section 4 of his s42A report. In short I must consider:

a. whether the plan change accords with, and assists the Council to carry out its functions for the purpose of giving effect to the RMA; and whether it accords with Part 2 of the RMA (s74(1)(a) and (b));

b. whether the plan change gives effect to relevant national policy statements, a national planning standard and the operative regional policy statement (s75(3)(a), (ba) and(c));

c. whether the plan change has regard to relevant strategies prepared under another Act (s74(2)(b)(i)); and takes into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority (s74(2A)); and

d. whether the plan change is inconsistent with any regional plan (s75(4)(b)).

e. whether the rules proposed have regard to the actual or potential effects on the environment including, in particular, any adverse effects (s76(3)).

203. Section 32 of the RMA requires that rules are to implement the policies and are to be examined, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, as to whether they are the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the District Plan taking into account:

i. the benefits and costs of the proposed policies and methods (including rules); and

ii. the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules, or other methods; and

iii. if a national environmental standard applies and the proposed rule imposes a greater prohibition or restriction than that, then whether that greater prohibition or restriction is justified in the circumstances.

204. I note that the tests relate to the appropriateness of the rules to achieve the objectives of the CDP.

Actual Or Potential Effects on the Environment

205. In my preceding discussions I have assessed the actual and potential effects on the environment in relation to the issues raised in submissions. I have found that the environmental effects of the proposal are acceptable in relation to:

- Urban form.
- Housing and business sufficiency and development feasibility.
- Character, amenity and visual effects.
- Infrastructure and land development effects, including 3Waters, utilities, neighbourhood Parks, earthworks and nuisance effects and community facilities.
- Transport network safety, efficiency and accessibility.
- Human health and natural hazard risks.
- Reverse sensitivity.
- Natural, cultural and historic sites and values.
- Property and social wellbeing.

206. I consider that the above matters encompass the range of actual and potential environmental effects relevant to the PC23 proposals, and that there are no other relevant effects matters to that I am required to have regard to in terms of s76(3).

Relevant Planning Documents

207. I agree that the relevant national directions include the NPS-UD, NPS-NH, NPS-I, NPS-HPL and NPS-FWM. The CRPS is the relevant regional policy statement. I have discussed these documents in my preceding evaluations and findings and comment as follows:

National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)

208. I have discussed the NPS-UD in relation to submissions concerning Urban Form and Housing and Business Sufficiency in preceding sections of this decision.

209. I have found that PC23 will be consistent with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD in that it will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and that it will provide for development capacity consistent with Policy 2.

210. Whilst PC23 will result in effects on surrounding RuUFZ properties, these effects require consideration against the anticipated development under the SPRZ, and the proposal is mostly considered to be an intensification of an existing urban environment. In this respect I note that Policy 6 acknowledges that planned urban built form in RMA planning documents may involve significant changes to an area, and those changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by others and anticipates increased housing densities.

211. I agree that PC23 is consistent with Policy 8 in that it will add significantly to development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.

212. Overall, I consider PC23 to be consistent with the NPS-UD.

National Policy Statement on Natural Hazards (NPS-NH)

213. The appropriate NPS-NH risk matrix has been applied to the PC23 proposals in respect to flood risk, coastal inundation and tsunami risk, and geotechnical risk, and concluded that such risks are low or negligible.

214. I find that PC23 meets the requirements of the NPS-NH.

National Policy Statement for Infrastructure (NPS-I)

215. Mr Friedel advised that he did not consider that PC23 would compromise any strategically significant infrastructure identified in the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan. He also noted that Ms McDonald had confirmed that the development land can be serviced with reticulated water and wastewater services. I accept that advice.

216. Mr Friedel raised concern that questions remained as to the appropriateness of the accessibility network, transport safety and efficiency and integration of the stormwater management facilities with the hydrological systems. Additional information has now been provided on these matters, and given my evaluation and findings above, I consider they have been adequately resolved.

217. I find that PC23 is consistent with the objective and relevant policies of the NPS-I.

National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL)

218. The existing SPRZ land is an urban zone and is not defined as Highly Productive Land (**HPL)**. A small portion of RuUF zoned land in the south-eastern corner of 176 Turners Road is the only area of HPL located within the PC23 land. I agree with Mr Freidel that the small size of the area of highly productive land makes it appropriate for rezoning under the circumstances as clause 3.4 (5)(d) of the NPS-HPL.

219. Overall I find PC23 to be consistent with the NPS-HPL.

National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (NPS-FWM)

220. I have discussed effects of PC23 on ecological values of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River, associated wetlands and riparian margins. I agree with the assessments of Ms Coates and Dr Shadbolt that the development works enabled by PPC23 would contribute to net ecological benefits through the naturalisation of local drains and the riparian margin. I also consider that adverse effects of potential sediment and/or contaminant discharge to the wetlands and river will be appropriately controlled through the regional plan and consenting regimes.

221. Overall I find that PC23 will be consisted with the NPS-FWM.

Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)

222. The main issues concerning the CRPS are those contained in the Chapter 6 provisions concerning urban growth within Greater Christchurch. I have discussed this in relation to Urban Form and Housing and Business Sufficiency in preceding sections of this decision.

223. I have found that the existing SPRZ provides for urban activities as defined in the CRPS, and

that it must be regarded as being an existing urban area for the purpose of the relevant policies. This is despite it not being included in Map A. I have noted that the SPRZ was approved in 2010 prior to the Chapter 6 provisions being inserted in 2013, therefore it was an existing urban area at that time and would not therefore have required identification as a greenfield priority area.

224. In relation to key relevant CRPS policies, I find that:

- PC23 is consistent with Policy 6.3.1(3) in that it will enable development of an existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas, including intensification in an appropriate location, that supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch; and
- PC23 is consistent with Policy 6.1.3(4) in that it provides for new urban activities occur within an existing urban area; and
- Development will be in accordance with an outline development plan as directed by Policy 6.3.3; and
- PC23 will not compromise transport effectiveness in terms of Policy 6.3.4; and
- Efficient and effective functioning of infrastructure, including transport corridors, is able to be maintained, and the ability to maintain and upgrade that infrastructure retained in accordance with Policy 6.3.5.

225. Overall I find that PC23 is consistent with the CRPS.

Christchurch District Plan

226. The relevant CDP provisions need to be considered when determining the appropriateness of PC23 and evaluating the relief sought in submissions. The PPC23 Section 32 Report evaluates the proposal against the relevant CDP Strategic Directions, objectives and policies.

227. As noted by Mr Friedel PC23's primary reliance on the settled CDP provisions, including the RNNZ, RuUFZ and OWMZ, ensures that the amendments being sought will be consistent with the Chapter 3 Strategic Directions and the supporting objectives and policies.

228. Mr Friedel identified apparent shortcomings in some technical assessments and encouraged the applicant to provide an updated assessment of CDP objectives and policies once additional information had been provided. Given that the additional information and expert conferencing outcomes have generally satisfied these shortcomings, I agree that no further assessment is now required.

Part 2 RMA

229. Under section 74 (1)(b), any changes to the CDP must accord with Part 2 of the RMA.

230. I agree with Mr Friedel that the Purpose of the Act is currently reflected in the settled CDP objectives and policies, which PPC23 does not seek to change. Rather, PPC23 seeks to rezone the land to a combination of RNNZ and RuUFZ and to coordinate the subdivision and development of the site through the replacement ODP and the addition of additional rules.

231. I agree that the protection of areas of significance identified with the Pūharakekenui-Styx River

corridor and the species and habitats it supports are consistent with section 6 (c), and that enhancement of public access to its margins is consistent with section 6 (d). I also agree that the site avoids impacting the coastal environment, any outstanding natural features and landscapes in terms of sections 6 (a) and (b).

232. I have found that the site does not contain known sites of cultural or historic significance that would require protection in terms of sections 6 (e) and (f).

233. I am satisfied that natural hazard risks will be effectively managed in terms of section 6(h).

234. I consider that PC23 will be consistent with relevant matters to be had particular regard to under section 7, including

(b) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:

(c) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:

(d) intrinsic values of ecosystems;

(f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment: and

(i) the effects of climate change.

Section 32AA Evaluation

235. Section 32AA requires assessment of any changes that have been made to the proposal since the evaluation report was completed.

236. Section 32AA(1) provides:

> *(1) A further evaluation required under this Act—*
>
> *(a) is required only for any changes that have been made to, or are proposed for, the proposal since the evaluation report for the proposal was completed (the changes); and*
>
> *(b) must be undertaken in accordance with section 32(1) to (4); and*
>
> *(c) must, despite paragraph (b) and section 32(1)(c), be undertaken at a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the changes; and*
>
> *(d) must—*
>
> *(i) be published in an evaluation report that is made available for public inspection at the same time as the approved proposal … or the decision on the proposal, is notified; or*
>
> *(ii) be referred to in the decision-making record in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the further evaluation was undertaken in*

accordance with this section.

(2) To avoid doubt, an evaluation report does not have to be prepared if a further evaluation is undertaken in accordance with subsection (1)(d)(ii).

237. Several changes have been made to the proposal as reflected in the amended ODP provisions provided in the course of the hearing, and in the Planning JWS. These changes have arisen due to agreements met between experts during the expert conferencing process, and by the applicant in response to matters raised through the s42A reports and submitter evidence. These form the basis for the recommended amended PC23 provisions contained in **Appendix One.**

238. I have discussed these changes and the reasons for them in relation to the specific submission issues and JWS agreements in the body of this decision. This has been undertaken in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the further evaluation was undertaken, for the purpose of s32AA(1). Accordingly, under s32AA(2) no further evaluation report is required.

Overall Conclusions

239. Overall, for the reasons that I have set out above, I conclude that PC23 is appropriate in terms of the s32 tests and meets the purpose and principles set out in Part 2 of the RMA in promoting sustainable management. Specifically, it will enable people and communities to provide for their economic and cultural wellbeing by provision of additional residential development in North-eastern Christchurch where the effects of that development can be acceptable and mitigated.

240. I have had particular regard to the wider strategic planning framework, and in particular the CRPS and NPS-UD. I have found that the existing SPRZ is an existing urban area for the purpose of the CRPS, and an urban environment as defined in the NPS-UD, and that this also forms the environmental baseline for effects assessment. I agree that given the non-viability of the Golf Resort development on the land, that an alternative urban development through re-zoning is appropriate, and is an efficient use of the land. I agree that in terms of the NPS-UD and CRPS, that intensification of an existing zoned urban area is preferable to and can be distinguished from development of other unanticipated residential capacity.

241. I have concluded that this will add significant development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and that rezoning is the most appropriate outcome.

Recommendations

242. For the reasons above, I **recommend** to the Christchurch City Council:

1) Pursuant to Clause 10 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 the Council approves Plan Change 23 to the Christchurch District Plan as set out in Appendix One.

2) That for the reasons set out in the body of my Recommendation, the Council either accept, accept in part or reject the submissions identified in Appendix Two.



Graham Taylor

Hearing Commissioner

Dated: 18 November 2026