



Christchurch Central City Recovery Plan: A Liveable City

Comments follow from Peterborough Village / Pita Kāik which involves both commercial and residential interests within and around the highly damaged area bound by Colombo Street north, Salisbury Street, Barbadoes Street and the Ōtākaro Avon corridor. The village entity is a post-quake organisation active in assisting quality redevelopment of the fabric and community of the central city.

With a data-base enabling involvement of around 500 local interests, over the last 3 years we have variously work-shopped residential redevelopment concepts, mixed use design and contributed to planning methods for residential activity. A number of people attending Village presentations have responded saying they wish to sell up from the suburbs and move into our central city.

To provide comment on the proposed chapter, we specifically sought opinion from members long involved in developing, managing and leasing medium density residential developments within and beyond the Village and that are commercially active in the redevelopment of medium density housing.

We note that any residential sites for sale within the Village are being snapped up and redevelopment plans advanced, and that construction is completed or underway on a number of sites. Residential redevelopers have expressed considerable concern at the proposed regime. Whilst simplification is supported, the proposed changes are considered unhelpful to vibrant redevelopment of the area. Various proposed changes, particularly those addressed below, are considered contrary to the espoused primary objective of balancing flexibility for developers with certainty of amenity for current and potential residents. The objective is supported, but the proposed means are crude, short-sighted and not respectful of the quality city redevelopment sought.

Peterborough Village Inc. has previously supported the combination of densified redevelopment and high amenity. Thus Village interests support the aspirations outlined at pages 4 - 15, as these focus on a liveable city with high quality residential as well as mixed use residential development. However the high quality cannot be achieved through the City Plan changes proposed. The proposed changes target

speedy processing and not quality outcomes. The proposed methods also remove the urban design advisors and local interests from assisting in achieving the quality and suitability of adjoining new developments. Yet local experience has demonstrated the value of these contributions. The proposed methods are a serious threat to assurance for both developers and locals that a high amenity outcome would be achieved.

This Village had experienced considerable medium density development in previous decades. They varied substantially in quality. Some notable lesser quality developments are being demolished. The Council's previous Plan Change 53, which brought in the existing city plan provisions, addressed a noticeable deficiency in central city housing amenity with a comprehensive review process. The Change has been observed to result in the quality of housing improving. Developers are welcoming encouragement to do better. But such improvements are now at risk from the proposed planning regime.

Pre-quake that planning regime was analysed would enable accommodation of more than 20,000 residents within the central city. That is, the heights, setbacks, recession planes and even the parking requirements in the regime allowed for an adequate density of redevelopment to achieve the residential numbers sought.

In our Village, with most buildings being demolished, redevelopment is currently demonstrating both an increased density and also high quality amenity. The document displays a number of Village developments as examples, and yet these are known to have benefitted considerably from measures such as advice from the Urban Design Panel. Residential developers have also commented that meetings with neighbouring interests have also enabled them to improve their designs. In providing these comments on the proposed regime, residential developers spoken to have stated that the Urban Design Panel's advisory service benefitted their development and that neighbours opinion has been sought and respected. They do not support deletion of these provisions.

Peterborough Village thus seek reinstatement of the urban design rule (4.2.7), its restricted discretionary status (for three or more units) and related assessment matters where the Urban Design Panel can provide advice. It would not be appropriate for the government to support high quality design for residential development in the East Frame, and for business development, but not support quality redevelopment outside of The Core. This would be inequitable.

Development proposals involving matters of non-compliance with any development standards should continue to be **notified**. Thus we request the removal in 4a.1.4 of the final statement, *"resource consent applications in relation to non-compliance with any development standards shall not be publicly or limited notified"*.

Village interests, including those making substantial redevelopment investments in the area, are alarmed at the proposed changes in that they will likely encourage low-

cost, low quality high density re-development that will devalue the neighbourhood from that which many are working toward. Interests do not support that assessment should be focussed on enabling “*more efficient, cost-effective and or practical use of the site*”. We ask that in every instance this be balanced with an **assessment matter seeking high quality design respectful of the context**.

To ensure adequate amenity, adequate recession planes are important. We do not agree that they be made steeper. Thus we seek that as per Appendix 1, Volume 3, Part 2, Living “*apply recession plane containment angle **diagram D** to the central city living zone*”, and NOT diagram E.

A number of the proposed changes remove measures that assist in ensuring the ‘Liveable City’ sought by the various commercial and residential interests working toward vibrant, high quality and appealing central city redevelopment. Amendments are therefore necessary. We welcome opportunity to meet and discuss and further explain these comments and associated matters.

Barry Brooker, Chairperson

Peterborough Village Inc.
Central Christchurch
c/- 15 Moa Place
Christchurch 8013

ph 03 3667 663

Chair@peterboroughvillage.org.nz

www.peterboroughvillage.org.nz

