

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 17 April 2007 at 9.15am

PRESENT: Councillor Gail Sheriff (Chair),
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Graham Condon,
David Cox, Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing, Sue Wells and
Norm Withers.

IN ATTENDANCE: Burwood/Pegasus Community Board chair Glenda Burt.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Barry Corbett,
Anna Crighton, and Carole Evans.

1. **UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TEXT RESULTING FROM THE NEW BRIGHTON RESIDENTIAL DENSITY STUDY.**

The Council's Senior Planner, Jonathan Clease, introduced the topic and recapped on the process undertaken to date. Ken Gimblett, Senior Planner from Boffa Miskell Ltd, spoke to the PowerPoint presentation (hard copy on file.)

Questions and issues raised relating to the presentation included:

Living 3 Zone

- Q: **Living 3 zone** - why increase to 14m critical standard? A: Development potential, plus allows views above dunes, and general urban form etc. Only the development standard applies at present.
- Q: Any net gain having 14 m critical standard? A: Would mean another story on top of what is currently allowed.
- Q: Proposed Plan Change is an opportunity to raise the design and appearance (D and A) standard in this area and for L3 right across the city, to avoid a repeat of what is happening in St Albans? A: Two fold: (a) Balance against existing development opportunity under L3, and (b) additional cost for developers through extra step in process. Design decisions relative to density. Wider review of L3 and L4 zones city wide may capture this, but Brighton provides opportunity to put in place. Changes to height provisions proposed, but need to be aware of impact, and need to be well-designed.
- Councillor Wells: Proposal is all about urban design and raising the bar through a comprehensive micro-plan. Could be a higher density area, with better built form. Have D and A aspects been considered for 3-unit development /dwellings, rather than 4? Consider dropping the bar to capture 3-unit? Suggested that the 11 metres criteria be revisited in conjunction.
- Q: Why not 5 storeys, rather than 4? A: Five storeys is do-able, but landscape, public space and amenity affects led to the 14 metre being struck. Would affect in particular the neighbours on the south side given north-south aspect of this area.

Living 4C Zone

- No retailing on ground floor proposed or sought from consultation to date. Recognised need to keep development compact and not compromise residential or commercial viability of the mall. Plus there is a reasonable area of B2 commercial zoned land fronting onto Marine Parade that already allows for residential development with retailing on the ground floor.
- Q: Recession plane rules – is the shadow affecting the properties across the road taken into the calculations? A: No - only adjoining properties. Width of road with berm in middle helps shading situation.
- B2 zone - proposal for development to 20-30 metres to ensure consistency.
- Boundary options - L3 at 5 storey level had been considered - had to be tested against recession planes etc, and was considered better to go for L4C.
- L4C would be a notable transition from L3 and what could conceivably occur has been considered.
- Councillor Wells - frame showing *L4C Site (proposed 20m max) Mid-winter - Mid Day* - how long is shade in place? Ken - worst case scenario shown - can be calculated and the information provided to elected members.

Business 2 Zone

- Q: Why not keep to a uniform 20 metre height? A: Big picture design: Bell-shaped curve - 30 m at front, then dropping to 20 m then 14m so doesn't have flat top look.
- Design appearance rules - thresholds will be the same as Living zones.
- Q: Difference between community standard and development standards? A: Different thresholds affects assessment.
- Wind effects - under 20 m height the effects can be positive and localised. Height above 20 m - that can change.
- Mall - Shadow angle is a rule for shadow angle to protect sunlight to mall.

Design and Appearance Rule

- **Q: Frame Applies to Business and Living zones where ≥ 4 residential units or to any building $> 11m$ in height questioned.** A: Subjective area - Design panel could be a solution? Decided to put the proposal out "as is" for an indication through the submission process.

Open Space 2 Zone

- The New Brighton Library is located within this zone.
- Q: Have public safety responsibilities and obligations as a TLA been explored? A: Low-level development -considered not putting undue structures in the area.
- Once the community has settled on the preferred "package" through the submission process, consideration of the future use of the open space e.g. tendering for proposals, could then be considered in detail.

Way Forward

- L4C zone on northern side - road not nearly as wide - big shadow effect. Jonathan undertook to distribute information through pigeon holes on how shadow moves. Satisfied not a significant effect. Ken proposed providing two examples - existing and comparative. Email diagrams to Councillors.
- Report to Council in next month for formal decision to proceed.
- Pending Council resolution to proceed with notification two more open days will be held during May in New Brighton to explain the process.
- Once notified, the statutory process to follow.

Additional Questions

- Q: Any perceived conflict with UDS? A: No.
- Living 3 and L4 at North Beach: Plot ratio difference explained. Recession planes are also more lenient than L3.
- Plan Change proper on page 3 of document circulated was referred to. How would Policy 11.52 read for application city-wide?
- The Council needs to look at the bigger picture rather than taking an interim step and plan for long term effects e.g. UDS/public transport issues. Why not encourage slender buildings/higher density with more open space - consider what will this look like in 50 years time? Has a big area for business, with bigger L3 area been considered?
- Q: L3 - why not allow 15 m/5 stories - what then changes? Better potential with views to encourage people to live there with only small shift required. A: Would force buildings further away from the boundary - may need a bit more land to do that. L3 would require two titles. Shading potential with additional height. Have set 14m as "line in the sand" and try to maximise opportunity up to that height.
- Some concern expressed with height of buildings abutting beach.

The seminar concluded at 11.05am.

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 17 April 2007 at 1.30 pm

- PRESENT:** Councillor David Cox (Chair),
Councillors Graham Condon, Pat Harrow, Bob Shearing,
Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and Norm Withers.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Glenda Burt (Chair, Burwood/Pegasus Community Board)
and Yani Johanson (Community Board member).
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore and Councillors Barry Corbett,
Anna Crighton, and Carole Evans.

	ACTION
<p>1. POSTER BOLLARDS INSTALLATION AND REVIEW OF POLICIES FOR STRUCTURES ON STREETS AND ROAD STOPPING</p> <p>1. POSTER BOLLARDS</p> <p>Weng-Kei Chen spoke to a PowerPoint presentation entitled POSTER BOLLARDS covering background information, proposed locations and a way forward. The views of elected members were sought prior to a report to Council. (Hard copy on file.) Additional information and support was provided by Robert O'Connor, Council solicitor.</p> <p>The following points arose during the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Location issues: Noted that input sought from the relevant Community Boards, with the decision-making resting with the Council.• Commitment to 100 bollards? Report to Council sought on the consequences of withdrawing from the contract in part.• Q: Clarification sought on the legal obligations under LGA regarding consultation aspects - CCC or the billboard company, as the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board had been informed Phantom would consult following Board's decision. A: Adjacent property owners and affected parties consulted. The Council has discretion with whom it may consult.• Q: What system in place for monitoring of signs meeting the terms of the contract? What is the Council process for deciding which posters will be displayed, and auditing of such. Michael A to respond in due course.	<p>Michael/Chen</p>

ACTION

- Concerns were raised at the lack of consultation with the Burwood/Pegasus community and safety issues surrounding the Marshlands Road/Palms site. There will be an opportunity to readdress this issue when the report which comes to the Council.
- Q: How is the percentage return to the Council audited?
A: Revenue for the Council will be several years away.
- Q: Libraries - were voluntary libraries included in the allocation?
A: No.

Consultation –the LGA 2002 obligations to consult were then discussed. The seminar was advised that the Act, whilst imposing extensive obligations on the Council to consult when making decisions, does allow the Council a discretion to determine the level of consultation required according to the circumstances. By its resolution from June 2003 the Council appeared to have decided on the level of consultation required – that resolution was quoted as follows:

“3. That prior to consideration by the Subcommittee:

- (a) *Site proposals be submitted to the relevant Community board for comment.*
- (b) *Immediate property owners be informed of the proposal and invited to comment.”*

Outcome:

Council officers were asked to take into account the matters raised during the seminar when preparing the report to the Council.

2. PRIVATE USE OF A LEGAL ROAD - REVIEW OF COUNCIL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Weng-Kei Chen then spoke to a PowerPoint presentation, (hard copy on file) which covered the Council’s Structures on Streets Policy; Approval of Vehicle Access to Property; and Disposal of Surplus Legal Road. The seminar was in response to the Council’s request for a review of the Council’s existing Policy on Structures on Streets.

The following points were made during the presentation:

- Q: An ad hoc response not always disadvantageous: the Council may not require “blanket” policy as can provide an opportunity to create greenspace? A: A matter of balance. Every property owner has a right to access from legal road. Staff seeking “a guideline” only - not asking for change in Council policy. Also noted that Community Boards have delegation to decide on land issues. Staff are seeking to eliminate uncertainties on these issues.

ACTION

- Q: Where does the Council policy sit with relation to roadside vendors? Big problem in the Fendalton/Waimairi wards. A: This is a separate issue from the one under consideration. Officers undertook to pass this request on for a comment back.
- Q: What statistics are available on the overall impact of ad hoc decisions made in the past city-wide. A: 90% would be in the Hagley-Ferrymead wards, particularly Scarborough from prior to 1974. Also has been an increase in requests for drive-on access to properties. Chen to supply list and relevant information to Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board member Yani Johanson before the report goes to the Council.
- Q: Charging for occupancy - what opportunities for the Council? A: This aspect will be included as part of review.
- Q: Fendalton /Waimairi Community Board report for sale of parcel of land - Council said “no” - keep it all as park. What costs the Council to maintain land - funding issues. Merivale example cited. Staff were requested to ascertain the ongoing costs of maintaining the resultant greenspace.

General comments included:

- Currently a new licence is required when property sold – considered an inappropriate method for the Council to administer surplus legal road. Officers are recommending the Council discontinue this process, and work towards stopping roads and selling the land at market value.
- City Plan considerations need to be recognised, as the city may have extra roading requirements in the long term, particularly in the hot spot areas.

OUTCOME:

Council officers were asked to take into account the matters raised during the seminar when preparing the report to the Council, and provide the additional information as sought by elected members.

The seminar concluded at 2.46pm