

12. REPORT FROM REGULATORY AND PLANNING MEETING OF 20 APRIL 2012:
PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 67 – HIGHFIELD



General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager District Planning
Author:	Fiona Eunson, Senior Planner, District Planning

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the information needed for the Committee to make a recommendation to the Council for a decision required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) under clause 25 of Schedule 1, on whether to accept, adopt or reject the plan change request lodged by Highfield Park Ltd, and then seek approval for notification of the plan change.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The plan change request proposes the rezoning of approximately 260 hectares of land between the Styx River and Queen Elizabeth II Drive, to the east of the suburb of Redwood and Northcote, from Rural 3 (Styx - Marshland) to Living G (Highfield). The Living G (Highfield) zone includes a mix of residential densities and other activities together with two discreet areas of Business 1 zone (refer to **Attachment 1** for the plan change locality and **Attachment 2** for the Outline Development Plan (CODP) of proposed land uses). The attachments for this report have been separately circulated.
3. The plan change request was lodged on 23 September 2011. Since this time the request has undergone review and analysis, with the applicant being asked to provide further information on two occasions and to make modifications to the request (cl 23 - 24 of Schedule 1 to the RMA).
4. The plan change request and supporting information now contains sufficient information to enable the Council to continue the processing of the request as required under clause 25 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. This clause gives the Council the option of:
 - (a) accepting the request in whole or in part, then proceeding to publicly notify it for public submissions and hearing at the cost of the applicant; or
 - (b) adopting the request in whole or in part as its own, then proceeding to public notify it for public submissions and a hearing at the cost of the Council; the objectives and policies of the request would have legal effect once publicly notified; or
 - (c) rejecting the request in whole or in part although this can only be done on limited grounds; or
 - (d) dealing with the request as if it were an application for resource consent.
5. At this stage the detailed merits of the plan change request are generally not relevant. In reviewing the request consideration of the merits of the proposal at a high level or coarse scale has been undertaken as part of determining whether sufficient information has been provided. If the Committee decides to accept or adopt the request for public notification the merits of the plan change can be considered in detail if a hearing of submissions is held.
6. The applicant proposes a range of measures to address potential issues associated with development of the site and the proposed Living G (Highfield) zoning.
7. This report concludes with the following recommendation:

That the Regulatory and Planning Committee recommends to the Council that it:
 - (a) accepts the request for Plan Change 67 (rezoning of Rural 3 (Styx – Marshland) to Living G (Highfield) and Business 1 (Local Centre/District Centre Fringe)) in whole in accordance with clause 25(2)(b) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and proceed to publicly notify it.

12 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. Should the Council decide to accept or adopt the plan change request and then notify the plan change for public submissions there are legal processes which must be followed in accordance with Schedule 1 to the RMA. These are standard processes that all plan changes must follow and if these processes are correctly followed, no particular financial risks are foreseen.
9. Costs arise at the various stages of the plan change process. Following public notification and assuming the plan change attracts public submissions, there will be costs associated with the reporting by staff (and consultant experts) to assist the hearings panel in responding to submissions. The scale of these costs will depend on the number and the level of complexity of the submissions received. As this is a privately initiated plan change request these costs are largely recoverable from the applicant if the request is accepted by the Council. If the Council resolved to adopt the plan change as its own, it will need to absorb all the processing costs.
10. Looking ahead to the completion of a hearing and the notification of the decisions, should the applicant or submitters appeal the decision to the Environment Court then costs incurred by the Council would not be recoverable, except in instances where the Court may award costs.

ALIGNMENT OF REPORT WITH 2009-2019 LTCCP BUDGETS

11. The 2010/11 budget for the District Planning work programme, adopted by the Council and provided for in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP), includes funding for processing of this plan change request. As this is a private plan change request these costs are largely recoverable.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

12. The RMA outlines the legal process which must be followed when processing a plan change request. At this stage were the Council to decide to reject the request or turn it into a resource consent the Council's decision can be appealed by the applicant to the Environment Court.
13. Assuming the Council decides to accept or adopt the request, subsequent stages of the process include the public notification of the plan change followed by the submission and further submission phases, the preparation of a report and the evidence of experts to assist the hearings panel or commissioner, the hearing of submissions, the release of decisions and finally possible appeals to the Environment Court.
14. If this process is followed there is generally no particular legal risk associated with processing a plan change request however there are potential legal implications if the Council's hearings panel does not have the scope it needs to amend the plan change to address matters which the Council may wish to have considered.
15. During the process of evaluating whether sufficient information was supplied with the plan change request there were issues of merit identified. The applicant made amendments to address many of these matters. For those matters for which agreement could not be reached the Council has the opportunity to lodge a submission on the plan change request and the matters will be raised in the officers report to the hearings panel should it decide to accept or adopt the request for public notification.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. Processing of the plan change request is a statutory requirement of the Council and is consistent with the LTCCP and Activity Management Plans. The allocation of funding and timing of infrastructure programmes such as those involving the Northern Relief Sewer and roading network improvements such as the Northern Arterial and roading intersections in the vicinity of the plan change site have the potential to impact on development of plan change site.

SUPPORT FOR A LEVEL OF SERVICE OR PROJECT IN THE 2009-2019 LTCCP

17. The proposal is part of the district planning levels of service in the LTCCP.

12 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. The Council has developed a number of the strategies which the City Plan assists with implementing. The potential for alignment of the plan change request with key strategies is summarised below.
19. The plan change request aligns with the *Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and Action Plan 2007* (UDS) to which the Council is a party. A key priority of this strategy is now reflected in Chapter 12A of the Regional Policy Statement which establishes an urban limit for Christchurch and achieving a density target of 15 households per hectare. The site of the plan change request is located within the urban limit and provides for 2200 households as required by Policies 1 and 6 of Chapter 12A. The request includes an Outline Development Plan and makes some provision for the staging of site development with respect to upgrading of the roading network infrastructure as required under Policy 8.
20. The *Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy and Action Plan* (GC TDMS) is a key approach in the UDS that establishes travel demand management policy direction, targets and actions to achieve a more sustainable transport system. The plan change request appears to promote measures that reflect some of the aims of the Strategy by locating the proposal adjacent to existing residential areas, providing for high density residential areas within close proximity to trip generating activities and planned future public transport routes and by providing a permeable movement network within the proposed urban form to decrease trip distances and enhancing opportunities to walk and cycle within the area.
21. The *Climate Smart Strategy 2010-2025* provides a vision for Christchurch that is resilient to the impacts of climate change. The plan change request appears to contribute to achieving objectives 4-5, 8-10 of the *Strategy* which aim to grow community capacity and foster partnerships that respond to climate change, encourage sustainable households and communities, encourage green and healthy places and spaces, enhance the resilience of habitats and ecosystems and promoting energy conservation and renewable energy.
22. The Council *Public Open Space Strategy 2010-2040* addresses the provision and maintenance of public open space for Christchurch over the next 30 years. The Strategy's primary focus is public parks, roads, waterways and coastline managed by the Council. The *Strategy* divides public open space into green, blue and grey spaces where green space is largely covered in vegetation, including parks and margins of water bodies; blue space is the surface water bodies or waterways; and grey spaces primarily refers to the street network which also provides for passive recreation, amenity and elements of the green space, such as grass berms and plantings.
23. The Public Open Space Strategy's *Priority Initiatives to 2040* includes as a priority the enhancement of recreation opportunities and active transport around the Styx River where linkages to the coast and to Queen Elizabeth II Drive are proposed. The plan change request appears to recognise this priority through the proposed open space reserve status of land adjoining the Styx River, the connection between the Styx River and Queen Elizabeth II Drive by the Central Boulevard, realigned Horners Drain and three neighbourhood parks.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

24. The plan change request covers land owned by approximately 45 individuals or groups including the Crown and the Council. The applicant indicates it holds land purchase options with up to 80% of the privately owned land and through these negotiations there has been on-going liaison with these landowners. Little contact has been made with the other landowners.
25. Approximately 50 hectares of land along the western boundary of the site is owned by NZTA and designated for the Northern Arterial road corridor. A site of around 11 hectares adjoining Queen Elizabeth II Drive is owned by the Council for the purpose of stormwater and flooding management. Consultation has been undertaken with NZTA and the Council.

12 Cont'd

26. Ngai Tahu is the tangata whenua with ancestral and traditional relationships with the land and waters within the area of the Christchurch City Council. The applicant reports being unsuccessful in consulting with Ngai Tahu. A request by Council staff for consideration of tangata whenua issues was sought from Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited (MKT) which acts for Ngai Tahu. This request was directed to the applicant and a response has since been received to the satisfaction of Council staff.
27. A memorandum to the Mayor and Councillors from the Programme Manager District Planning dated 10 February 2012 provided information on the status of processing the plan change request.
28. The Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee will consider the plan change request before referring their recommendation to the Council meeting in April 2012.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Council accepts the request for Plan Change 67 and Section 32 evaluation (rezoning of Rural 3 (Styx – Marshland) to Living G (Highfield) and Business 1 (Local Centre/District Centre Fringe)) in whole in accordance with clause 25(2)(b) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and proceed to publicly notify it.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory and Planning Committee considered this report at its meeting of 20 April 2012. The recommendation from the Committee will be forwarded to the Council.

BACKGROUND

THE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST

29. The request for Plan Change 67 (Highfield) proposes rezoning approximately 260 hectares of land adjoining the eastern boundary of the suburbs of Redwood and Northcote in northern Christchurch from Rural 3 (Styx – Marshland) to a new Living G (Highfield) zone, which includes two Business 1 zoned areas. This location is within the urban limits for Christchurch City as identified in Chapter 12A of the Canterbury Regional Council's Regional Policy Statement (RPS) which became operative in 2011.
30. The northern, eastern, southern and western boundaries of the plan change site are formed respectively by the Styx River, Hawkins and Hills roads, Queen Elizabeth II Drive and land designated for the proposed Northern Arterial road corridor. Much of the site is presently in pasture with rural residential properties adjoining parts of the eastern boundary which aligns with Hawkins and Hills roads.
31. The proposed Living G (Highfield) zone is a mixed use, multiple residential density zone modelled on other Living G zones within Christchurch (i.e. Awatea, East Belfast, Halswell West, Prestons, Wigram and Yaldhurst). This zoning proposes 2200 residential allotments across approximately 50% of the plan change site. The four residential densities proposed are similar to those used for Living G (Prestons).
32. Within the Living G (Highfield) zone are two areas of Business 1 (Local Centre/District Centre Fringe) zone covering approximately 6000m² in Gross Floor Area. These Business zones are located in two discreet areas within the northern and southern portions of the site that lie north and south of Prestons Road.
33. The proposed Northern Arterial road corridor designation occupies approximately 50 hectares along the western boundary and south-western corner of the plan change site with a large portion of the west and south of the site dedicated as to future stormwater management. Development of approximately one third of the allotments located in the southern portion of the plan change site adjoining Queen Elizabeth II Drive is deferred until stormwater management issues for this area are resolved.

12 Cont'd

34. The plan change request proposes realigning Horners Drain to become a central feature of a linear park that adjoins the Central Boulevard which runs north to south through the site linking Business 1 zone areas. Three neighbourhood parks are located across the site.

RELEVANT RMA PROVISIONS

35. The processing of plan change requests is covered by clauses 21 - 29 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. Those aspects of these clauses relevant to this request are:
- who may request a change to a district plan (clause (cl) 21);
 - that the request be in writing, explain its purpose and reasons, include an evaluation under s32 of the RMA and an assessment of potential environmental effects under Schedule 4 (cl 22);
 - further information may be required to better understand the potential environmental effects of the plan change (and may include the commissioning of reports); ways in which effects may be mitigated; the benefits and costs, efficiency and effectiveness, possible alternatives; and the consultation undertaken or required; timeframes applying; applicant's ability to decline to provide the further information and the Council ability to reject the request or not to approve it if there is insufficient information (cl 23);
 - with the agreement of the applicant the Council may modify the proposal (cl 24);
 - the Council must make a decision to either "adopt" the plan change request as if it were its own proposal and proceed to publicly notify it; "accept" it and proceed to public notification; reject the plan or treat it as if it were a resource consent (cl 25);
 - where the Council "accepts" the plan change it must publicly notify it within four months (cl 26);
 - the applicant may appeal the Council's decision made under clause 25 (cl 27).
 - applications may be withdrawn (cl 28).
 - unless rejected, the application is put through the standard process of public notification, submission, hearing, decision, and appeal (cl 29).

STATUTORY TIMEFRAMES

36. The plan change request was lodged by Highfield Park Ltd on 23 September 2011. Analysis of the plan change request was undertaken to determine whether sufficient information had been provided to enable the Council to make its decision required under clause 25 of Schedule 1 to the RMA, i.e. to adopt, accept or reject the request. Where there was an absence of expertise or insufficient staff capacity consultants were engaged to undertake the assessments.
37. After completing the initial assessment a request for further information (RFI) was made under clause 23 of the RMA on 25 November 2011. The time constraint imposed under section 37A for making a RFI was exceeded and approval was gained to extend the processing time. The applicant's response to the RFI was received on 14 December 2011.
38. Analysis of the information supplied by the applicant was undertaken and a second RFI was prepared together with a request made to modify aspects of the plan change request under clause 24 of the RMA on 10 February 2012. The time constraint imposed under section 37A for making a RFI was exceeded and approval was gained to extend the processing time. A response to the second RFI was received on 8 March 2012.
39. Following a meeting with the applicant on 14 March 2012 to discuss stormwater and open space matters additional information and a modified version of the plan change request was supplied. Another meeting with the applicant was held on 20 March to discuss sewerage related issues and a modified version of the ODP was received on 23 March.

THE OPTIONS

40. The Council is required to consider the plan change request under the processes outlined under clause 25 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. This clause gives the Council the option of accepting, adopting or rejecting the request or of processing the request as an application for resource consent. The four options are now evaluated in respect of the plan change request.

12 Cont'd

ACCEPT THE PLAN CHANGE

41. The option of accepting the plan change request means that the Council approves the request for public notification after which time the public may make submissions in opposition or support. Under this option the applicant would continue to bear the cost of managing and processing the plan change. In accepting the request for notification the Council would:
 - (i) be taking a neutral position by neither supporting or opposing the request; and
 - (ii) retain the ability to make a submission if it opposes any aspect of the request and wishes to alter the request.
42. The Council may determine it has reasons for making submissions in opposition to the plan change. If a submission is not received seeking an amendment to the plan change, it is unlikely there will be the scope needed by the hearings panel or commissioner to amend the plan change.
43. The assessments undertaken by the Council's staff have determined that there is sufficient information supplied to enable the plan change request to be publicly notified for public submissions. Further analysis of the accuracy and reasonableness of the proposal may raise concerns that the Council determines warrant the making of submissions on the plan change request. Accepting the request enables the Council to maintain its ability to remain neutral and to make a submission.

ADOPT THE PLAN CHANGE

44. The Council may adopt the plan change request and process it as if it were its own. The request is publicly notified and a hearing is held to enable any submitters to present their concerns to the Hearings Panel. By adopting the plan change request the Council:
 - (i) indicates that it supports the plan change request;
 - (ii) can control the request as if it were its own;
 - (iii) may alter parts of the request that it does not support prior to public notification;
 - (iv) takes over the costs associated with managing and processing the request.
45. Were the Council to adopt this plan change request it should have some rationale to justify this approach that has a public benefit, and is a better method for promoting the purpose of the Act or carrying out the Council's functions under section 31 (integrated resource management). Potentially the Council could use a similar justification to that used by the applicant of addressing the housing need created as a result of the 2010 - 2011 earthquakes.
46. Whilst it could be argued that there is justification in terms of earthquake recovery, the remaining parts of the resource management process are unlikely to be any quicker or easier if the Council adopted the Plan Change. Also, the proponent has responded positively to the majority of modifications sought by the Council, so there would be little to gain in terms of securing better outcomes.

REJECT THE PLAN CHANGE

47. Limited opportunities exist under the RMA for rejecting a plan change request. In addition to the grounds under clause 23(6) where the Council may reject or decide not to approve the request if the applicant has declined to provide the further information requested, a plan change may also be rejected if:
 - (i) it is frivolous or vexatious;
 - (ii) the substance of the request has been dealt with by the Council or the Environment Court in the last two years;
 - (iii) it is not in accordance with sound resource management practice;
 - (iv) it would make the District Plan inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA (other policies or plans, such as Regional Policies or Plans); or
 - (v) the District Plan has not been operative for more than two years.

12 Cont'd

48. The plan change request is not considered to contravene the requirements in (i)-(v) above. The applicant has provided a comprehensive proposal that is modelled on other Living G zones which have been approved by the Council. The analysis undertaken to date does not suggest that the plan change request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice therefore rejection of the plan change request at this stage cannot be supported.

TREAT AS A RESOURCE CONSENT

49. The plan change request may be converted to an application for resource consent. With this option the applicant bears all of the associated costs. It is suggested that the nature and scale of this proposal counts against it being processed as a resource consent. The plan change site covers an area of approximately 260 hectares and is currently zoned Rural 3.
50. The land use and subdivision consent applications for the scale of urban residential and commercial development proposed by the request would be a Non-complying Activity under the Rural 3 zoning contrary to the objectives and policies of the City Plan and highly unlikely to gain approval. It is therefore concluded that this rezoning proposal for such a large area of Rural zoned land is more appropriately tested through the plan change process.

ISSUES

51. The principal issues associated with the plan change request are summarised below. These and other issues, including those of potential interest to Ngai Tahu, and the means by which the applicant proposes addressing all issues, will be considered by the Council's hearings commissioner or panel should the request be accepted or adopted by the Council for public notification.

GEOTECHNICAL

52. The *Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Report Highfield Park* (Sept 2011) concludes that the site is geotechnically viable for residential development expected under the New Zealand's Department of Building and Housing (DBH) design criteria on liquefaction susceptible soils subject to engineering preparatory works. As the DBH *Guidelines for the geotechnical investigation and assessment of subdivisions in the Canterbury region* (Nov 2011) was finalised two months after the *Report* was completed, the applicant has since provided confirmation that the *Report* complies with the *Guidelines*. This confirmation is sufficient to enable the Plan Change to be notified.

STORMWATER AND FLOODING

53. The *Three Water Servicing* report indicates that the stormwater management system proposed for the site is based on discharging stormwater into Horners Drain and then into the Styx River while flood management involves realigning and increasing the capacity of Horners Drain. As this re-configuration is unlikely to completely address the extent of flooding in the south of the site, the applicant proposes deferring development in the southern part of the site until a full investigation is undertaken. The Council's stormwater engineers are comfortable with the mitigation concepts in terms of area and treatment for the part of the development north of the proposed deferment area, and there are safeguards in the Plan Change to enable the Council to address mitigation issues for the deferred area at the subdivision stage.
54. Approval of the stormwater management system proposed for the site is dependent in part on the Council obtaining resource consent approval from Environment Canterbury (ECan) to discharge stormwater to the Styx River (this is required under the Waimakariri River Regional Plan). The anticipated discharge is addressed in the draft Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) for the Styx River which is to be finalised in May 2012 for lodgement as part of the Council's application for resource consent approval from ECan. The Styx catchment is currently covered by the Waimakariri River Regional Plan (ECan has requested that CERA transfer the Styx catchment to coverage under the Natural Resources Regional Plan. This would enable Council to treat the Styx SMP consent as operative once it's been lodged as a

12 Cont'd

complete application, thereby creating greater certainty over the outcomes and timing for the applicant and Council.)

WASTEWATER AND WATER SUPPLY

55. The report *Three Water Servicing for Proposed Plan Change for Highfield Park* (Dec 2011) submitted in support of the plan change request proposes to either rely on a combination of the existing water supply system and new bore or to establish a completely new bore to service the site. Resource consent approval would be needed from ECan to take water.
56. The site is located in an area serviced by the Northern Relief Sewer. This Sewer was fragile prior to the 2010-2011 earthquakes but damage sustained due to these events has exacerbated infiltration and sewage overflow issues. The Council is working with Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Rebuild Team (SCIRT) to determine repair concepts for the sewer and appropriate upgrades. Repairs and upgrades to this sewer are currently programmed in the LTCCP between 2012/13 and 2015/16.
57. Some sewage overflows are permitted under resource consents held by the Council with ECan but these have been exceeded due to earthquake damage. Options to address this non-compliance are being explored with ECan who have indicated their preference that a new resource consent be obtained by the Council to accommodate any additional non-compliances associated with the plan change site. Obtaining resource consent approval could take up to two years to complete (and longer to resolve appeals). In the interim, there is a risk of a minor increase in wastewater discharging into the Avon River in periods of heavy rain, but advice from the Team Leader Network Planning is that this is not of such a concern to warrant the Plan Change not being notified.

TRANSPORT

58. The plan change request is supported by an *Integrated Transport Assessment* (ITA) (Dec 2011) that assesses the effects of traffic generated by the proposed development on the receiving transport environment including key intersections in the vicinity of the site. This area of the City has been affected by changes in traffic movements following the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes. The Council's transport consultants have expressed concerns at the level of development that could occur prior to completion of improvement works in northern Christchurch, and the construction of the Northern Arterial. These effects have not been quantified and it would be unreasonable to expect the proponent to have done this in the absence of detailed traffic modelling. The UDS partners are currently completing a modelling exercise which will help identify effects of this and other developments on the road network. It is anticipated that the results will be available to be used by the Council's hearing commissioner or panel.

LANDSCAPE

59. The key issues for landscape are those concerning the interface between the proposed development and the proposed Northern Arterial, and implications for the eastern end of Styx River corridor, western link of the Source to Sea walkway to Redwood Springs subdivision, and the celebration of Styx River Reserve. The *Preliminary Landscape Assessment* (Sept, 2011) assists in the understanding of the landscape and visual values associated with the site and the potential effects on these values from development under the proposed plan change. The Assessment suggests there will be environmental benefits for native plant communities, enhanced amenities and recreational opportunities. The Council's Senior Landscape Architect, after receiving additional information relating to the assessment, is satisfied that the assessment has adequately addressed the key issues.

OPEN SPACE AND ECOLOGY

60. The *Preliminary Landscape Assessment* (Sept 2011) and the *Outline Development Plan Background Report* (Mar 2012) both inform the provision of open space shown on the ODP. The major structuring element proposed for the site is the realigned Horners Drain within the centralised linear park adjacent to the Central Boulevard. The applicant promotes this corridor as providing identity and legibility, an attractive outlook to adjoining higher density housing and an area of public open space. Advice from the Council's Senior Park's Planner is that the Plan

12 Cont'd

Change more than adequately provides for open space requirements, with the amount proposed to be invested exceeding what the development contribution requires. This additional land will be gifted to the Council, with only a relatively minor increase in associated operational costs.

61. The *Ecology Assessment* (Sept, 2011) evaluates the existing aquatic ecological values at the plan change site, discusses potential effects of the construction phase and resultant effects of urbanisation on streams. Recommendations are made on how to enhance the ecology of the site. The Assessment concludes that the ecological values of Horners Drain and tributaries are generally poor although a number of fish taxa are present with good habitat and a healthy fish community in the reach between the development site and the confluence with the Styx River. Council. The Council's Waterways Planner Ecologist is satisfied with the overall assessment and, although the information is pitched at a high level, she considers that the proposed enhancements will have a positive effect on the overall local surface water environment.

URBAN DESIGN

62. The urban design component of the plan change request is largely considered in the *Outline Development Plan Background Report* (Mar 2012). The *Report* describes the context of the site, at the sub-regional, city and local scales, and includes analysis of the site and provides a platform for the ODP and its underlying design principles. The proposal has also been assessed against the criteria of the Urban Design Protocol and advice from the Council's urban design consultant is that the general principles of the Protocol have been applied.
63. The *Retail /Commercial Assessment and Recommendations* (Sept 2011) addresses activities within the proposed Business 1 zone and details the design philosophy and possible concepts for the neighbourhood centres. The conceptual urban design components of the request are largely represented in the ODP and in the rules in the Plan Change. Advice was sought from Property Economics Limited regarding distributional effects on other centres, and their advice is that there are unlikely to be any.

PLANNING

64. The plan change request is modelled on other Living G zones within the Christchurch City Plan. All have a slightly different approach. Much of the text of the request reflects aspects of Living G (Halswell West) but its location, scale and the constraints to site development in this area make it also similar to Living G (Prestons). It is considered that the Plan Change gives effect to Chapter 12A of the RPS including its key objectives and policies.
65. After processing the plan change request under clauses 23 and 24 of Schedule 1 to the RMA it is now concluded that there is sufficient information for the Council to make its decision under Clause 25 of Schedule 1 to the RMA on how it should continue to process the plan change request. It is not appropriate to consider the detailed merits of the request at this stage. If there are issues of merit that the Council considers important to address these can be raised in a submission by the Council to the plan change once it is publicly notified.

SUMMARY

66. In order for the Committee to decide on how to continue with processing the plan change request the Committee is directed to clauses 25(2), (3) and (4) of Schedule 1 to the RMA. The options provided under these clauses were discussed in detail in earlier sections of this report. In summary these options are:

Option 1: accept Plan Change 67 request for public notification (and supporting Section 32 evaluation) in accordance with clause 25(2)(b) of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991;

Option 2: adopt Plan Change 67 request and publicly notify it as if it were the Council's own plan change in accordance with clause 25(2)(a) of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991;

12 Cont'd

Option 3: deal with Plan Change 67 request as if it were an application for resource consent in accordance with clause 25(3) of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991; or

Option 4: reject Plan Change 67 request in accordance with Clause 25(4) of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

67. The preferred option is **Option 1**, i.e. accept the request for Plan Change 67 and supporting Section 32 evaluation (rezoning of Rural 3 (Styx – Marshland) to Living G (Highfield) and Business 1 (Local Centre/District Centre Fringe) in whole in accordance with clause 25(2)(b) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and proceed to publicly notify it.